This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

1888.

VOLUME XIX.

Published by the Association.

BOSTON:
PRESS OF J. S. CUSHING & CO.
1889.

Digitized by Google

105981

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS OF VOL. XIX.

I. The *Lex Curiata de Imperio* 5
By Professor WILLIAM F. ALLEN.

II. On the Impersonal Verbs 20
By JULIUS GOEBEL, Ph.D.

III. On the Authorship of the Cynicus of Lucian 33
By JOSIAH BRIDGE, Ph.D.

IV. The "Continued Allegory" in the First Book of the Fairy Queene 40
By J. ERNEST WHITNEY.

V. Standard English: its Pronunciation, How Learned . . . 70
By Professor FRANCIS A. MARCH.

VI. Register of New Words 79
By Professor FISK P. BREWER.

APPENDIX: —

Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Session, Amherst, 1888 v
Treasurer's Report vii
List of Officers and Members xxxix
Constitution of the Association lii
Publications of the Association liv

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,

1888.

I. — *The Lex Curiata de Imperio.*

By WILLIAM F. ALLEN,

PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

It is well known that the Roman magistrates, after entering upon their offices, procured the passage of a law defining their powers with precision. In the case of the censors this law was passed in the *comitia centuriata;* in the case of all the other patrician magistrates, in the *comitia curiata,* an assembly which existed in the later centuries of the republic for hardly any other purposes than this, and which accordingly sank into a purely formal assemblage, in which the several curies were represented by an equal number of beadles, *lictors.* Nevertheless, this purely formal act was regularly insisted upon down to the close of the republic. The law was of the same general character, whether passed by curies or centuries, and whether dealing with the *imperium* or not. Nevertheless, as it is best known in connection with the *imperium* of the consuls, praetors, and dictators, it has come to be known by the inexact title of *lex curiata de imperio.* The phrase *de imperio* is not properly a part of the title, but simply describes the scope of the law in reference to this particular group of magistrates; in the case of the aediles and quaestors, as well as of the censors, it would necessarily be *de potestate.* Nevertheless, it is only with regard to the *imperium* that the question can have any practical impor-

Digitized by Google

tance. Upon assuming office all magistrates entered without delay upon the exercise of the administrative and purely civil functions of their office, and the neglect to pass this law, or its failure through intercession of the tribunes, can have worked no practical reduction of their powers. The *imperium,* on the other hand, carrying with it the right to command troops and to inflict the death penalty, was too formidable a power to be exercised by any one who had not been formally invested with it. Consequently, while the law in question was, in relation to other offices, so pure a formality that it is known to us only as a piece of antiquarianism, the law *de imperio* is an act frequently mentioned, and possessing a real historical importance.

Here it is to be noticed that in the period after Sulla the consuls and praetors within their year of office possessed only the civil *imperium*, that is, general executive and administrative power within the limits of Italy; for them, therefore, it made no difference whether they secured the passage of this law or not, until the time came for them to go to the government of a province in the following year. This the possession of the *imperium*, which did not require to be renewed, enabled them to do without interruption. There is no doubt that the law, being now a mere formality, was often neglected; Cicero says (leg. agr. ii. 12, 30): *consulibus legem curiatam ferentibus a tribunis plebis saepe est intercessum.* In this case no embarrassment would result until it came to acts which rested distinctly upon the military *imperium*, such as holding the *comitia centuriata* (which power was, of course, contained in the limited *imperium* of this period), and taking the government of a province. Since our discussion therefore is exclusively confined to the right to exercise these powers, we will speak of the law in question by its familiar if inexact title, as *lex curiata de imperio.*

It has usually been held that this law actually conferred upon the magistrate the powers of his magistracy, the election and inauguration in the office being only inchoate and incomplete acts. Mommsen, however, in his *Römisches Staatsrecht* (i. p. 52, first edition), takes the ground that it is not to

Digitized by Google

be looked upon as an act of legislation, but rather as an obligatory act, which the citizens cannot refuse to a magistrate who has already entered upon his office: [*Als eigentlicher Volksbeschluss darf er nicht aufgefasst werden, sondern vielmehr als eine Verpflichtung, die die Bürgerschaft dem verfassungsmässig ins Amt gelangten Beamten nicht verweigern kann:*] and that it in strictness of speech gives the magistrate no right which he does not already possess [*Auch giebt der Act streng genommen dem Beamten kein Recht, das er nicht bereits hat*]. It is with diffidence that one differs from a scholar of Mommsen's authority; but as it is upon a question of interpretation rather than of fact, and as it is a frequent charge against this great man that he is prone to push his pre-conceived theories beyond what is warranted by the evidence, I will venture to present the grounds upon which I conclude that the *lex curiata de imperio*, even if it had become a mere formality, was nevertheless a necessary act, and did really confer the *imperium;* that without it the authority of the magistrate was incomplete.

Mommsen admits indeed that his proposition does not admit of positive proof [*geradezu beweisen lässt dieser Satz sich nicht*]: he maintains, nevertheless, that it follows by necessity from the nature of things, and is supported by the evidence of several well-established instances. If the city should be attacked before this law had been carried, it is not to be supposed that its defence would be omitted for the lack of a person qualified to take command. As to this it can only be said: *Salus populi suprema lex.* The case is quite analogous to that of a province left by the sudden death of its governor without any legitimate commander; in such a case, as Mommsen has himself shown (p. 179), there must of necessity have been some way of temporarily filling the vacancy. We may compare also the formula *videant consules ne quid res publica detrimenti capiat*, by which the Senate bestowed the military *imperium* upon the consuls, in great emergencies, during the period after Sulla, when these magistrates possessed only the civil *imperium.* It may be assumed that if the magistrates lacked the formal power to

Digitized by Google

command troops, the Senate would have bestowed upon them this extraordinary authority.

The first example which Mommsen adduces to support his view, is that of Caius Flaminius, consul B.C. 217, who entered upon his office at Ariminum and who, consequently, could not have carried the *lex curiata* for himself, as was certainly usual and as is assumed to have been requisite. But this assumed necessity is by no means proved. In the case of the inferior magistrates, who had not the power to convene the assembly, the law must of course have been presented for them by one of the consuls, and it is hard to see why the same cannot have been done by a consul for his colleague, as indeed had been Mommsen's opinion previously. The objection that the senatorial faction would not have been inclined to overlook an irregularity in the case of so obnoxious a person as Flaminius cannot have much weight in regard to a body inspired by so lofty a sense of patriotism as that which the Roman Senate displayed the next year towards a still more obnoxious consul, Varro. It is to be noticed that in the irregularities charged against Flaminius by the senatorial leaders (Livy, xxii. 1, 5) — *quod illi iustum imperium . . . esse?* — there is no mention of the want of the *lex curiata.* The objections are purely formal: *magistratus id* [*i.e., auspicium*] *a domo, publicis privatisque penatibus Latinis feriis actis, sacrificio in monte perfecto, votis rite in Capitolio nuncupatis secum ferre; nec privatum auspicia sequi, nec sine auspiciis profectum in externo ea solo nova atque integra concipere posse.*

Another instance is that of the consuls of B.C. 49, Lentulus and Marcellus, who continued to exercise authority during the following year as proconsuls, notwithstanding that they had neglected to procure the *lex curiata* before leaving Rome at the beginning of their term of office. But this case tells on the other side. The senatorial government at Thessalonica abstained from organizing for the year 48, by the election of new magistrates, for the reason that the failure to procure the *lex curiata* made it impossible for them to hold the *comitia centuriata* (*ὅτι τὸν νόμον οἱ ὕπατοι τὸν φρατριατικὸν οὐκ ἐσεηνόχεσαν,* Dio Cassius, 41, 43). The lack of

Digitized by Google

this law had not, it is true, prevented them from exercising military authority during the year 49: as has already been said, the military emergency required the assumption of power, and this may have been done by the authority of the Senate. But when it came to the specific formal act of holding the centuriate assembly, which, as being the army, could only be held in virtue of the military *imperium*, the consuls shrank from such a transgression of the law, and preferred to continue the informal exercise of the *imperium* which they already held. The case of Camillus, in his dictatorship, the only other case referred to, can be met by analogy with either of the two cases considered: as Mommsen says, he must either have foregone the *lex curiata*, or it must have been procured for him by some other magistrate.

A more puzzling case is that of Appius Claudius, consul B.C. 54, which is cited in another note. The circumstances in this case are peculiar, and can be understood only in connection with the succession of events during this summer, which are known to us pretty completely through Cicero's correspondence.[1] When the elections of July approached, rumors began to be rife of a corrupt bargain (the notorious *coitio Memmiana*) between the consuls Claudius and Domitius Ahenobarbus on the one hand and the consular candidates Memmius and Domitius Calvinus on the other (ad Q. fr. ii. 15, b. 4: ad Att. iv. 15, 7), but the terms of the bargain do not seem to have been known. It was probably these rumors that caused the election to be put off until September (ad Q. fr. ii. 16, 3). Towards the end of September, the two consular candidates having quarrelled, Memmius divulged the terms of the bargain in the Senate (ad Q. fr. iii. 1, 16), placing indeed written evidence in the hands of the consuls. The contract was to the effect that the consuls should secure the

[1] His letters to his brother Quintus (ii. 15 and 16, and iii.), nearly all dated, enable us to construct the chronology with approximate accuracy. Those to Atticus (iv. 15 to 18) are in great confusion; *e.g.* No. 16 has the date Oct. 1 (§ 7); but § 5 belongs to July 3–5 (cf. 15, 4), while §§ 9–12 come after Oct. 24. The edition of Baiter and Kayser has rearranged these sections so as to correspond to the chronology of the letters to Quintus.

Digitized by Google

election to these two men and that they for their part should produce fraudulent testimony to the passage of the *lex curiata de imperio* and of a *senatus consultum* making appropriations for the government of their provinces. Cicero's words are: *ipse et suus competitor Domitius Calvinus . . . HS quadragena consulibus darent, si essent ipsi consules facti, nisi tres augures dedissent, qui se adfuisse dicerent, cum lex curiata ferretur, quae lata non esset, et duo consulares, qui se dicerent in ornandis provinciis consularibus scribendo adfuisse, cum omnino ne senatus quidem fuisset:* ad Att. iv. 18, 2.

It would seem that the *lex curiata*, which was regularly passed in March, in which month the military *imperium* commenced, had not been passed this year, and as the year drew to a close, the consuls, to whom provinces had been assigned by the Senate, were anxious to secure the authority to enter upon their government. Of course the whole compact came to naught when once divulged. Both candidates were at once indicted for bribery, as well as their competitors, Messala and Scaurus, and the consuls must seek for other authority to take their provinces. Appius declared promptly that he would go to his province without the law, and pay his own expenses (ad Q. fr. iii. 2, 3; ad Att. iv. 16, 12). This was in October. The fullest statement of his plans is given in a letter (ad fam. i. 9, 25) to Lentulus Spinther, the then governor of Cilicia, to which there is no date, but which must have been written at this time: *Appius in sermonibus antea dictitabat, postea dixit etiam in senatu palam, sese, si licitum esset legem curiatam ferre, sortiturum esse cum collega provinciam: si curiata lex non esset, se paraturum cum collega tibique successurum: legem curiatam consuli ferri opus esse, necesse non esse: se, quoniam ex senatus consulto provinciam haberet, lege Cornelia imperium habiturum, quoad in urbem introisset.* Here is a positive assertion by Claudius, upon which Mommsen relies in his argument, that although the consul was under obligation (*opus*) to bring the law before the *comitia*, the passage of the law was not indispensable (*necesse*) to his possession of the *imperium;* and that if he is prevented (by tribunician intercession) from taking his

Digitized by Google

province by regular procedure, he will do it by a simple agreement with his colleague. Cicero adds that there is a difference of opinion as to the legal question, and that he himself does not feel quite certain — *mihi non tam de iure certum est — quamquam ne id quidem dubium est*, etc.; the last phrase apparently meaning that he is pretty certain that it is bad law. As a matter of fact, Appius went to his province and returned with the expectation of a triumph: but whether he had procured the *lex curiata* is uncertain. The year at any rate ended with an interregnum.

It will be noted that what Appius claimed was the right *de facto* to exercise the *imperium* in the province: the province had been assigned by the Senate, and, by the Cornelian Law (of Sulla), he could continue his command until he returned to the city. This seems to point to an exercise of military command by authority of the Senate, similar to that granted by the phrase *videant consules ne quid respublica detrimenti capiat:* but instead of resting his case simply upon the necessity of keeping the governmental machinery in operation, he undertook to defend his position by a legal quibble — that the law was *opus*, but not *necesse*.

That this assertion of Claudius was not a recognized principle of constitutional law, but a theory got up for the occasion, is made probable by the character of the man and his family. This Appius Claudius, elder brother of the demagogue Publius Clodius, was the head of that Claudian gens which Mommsen has shown to have been distinguished, not for conservatism and patrician arrogance, as is usually assumed, but for a revolutionary and innovating spirit. His consulship (B.C. 54) affords another illustration of his reckless interpretations of law. The Pupian Law forbade the Senate to meet on *dies comitiales:* the Gabinian Law set apart the sessions of the Senate in the month of February, to be devoted to foreign affairs — receiving embassies and making provision for the provincial governments. When Appius reached the day of the Quirinalia (Feb. 17) in his consulship, he appears to have found that the consideration of foreign affairs had not made so much headway as was desir-

Digitized by Google

able. The remainder of the month of February being chiefly made up of *dies comitiales*, he declared that he would use these for meetings of the Senate in spite of the Pupian Law: *Comitialibus diebus, qui Quirinalia sequuntur, Appius interpretatur non impediri se lege Pupia, quominus habeat senatum, et, quod Gabinia sanctum sit, etiam cogi ex Kal. Feb. usque ad Kal. Mart. legatis senatum quotidie dari* (Cic. ad Q. fr. ii. 13, 3). In his view the Gabinian Law superseded and set aside the operation of the Pupian Law. Nor was Appius the only lawless interpreter of laws in these lawless times. Two years before (B.C. 56), we find a tribune of the plebs claiming precedence over the consuls in the right to put questions to vote in the Senate: *Lupus, trib. pl. . . . intendere coepit ante se oportere discessionem facere quam consules* (Cic. ad fam. i. 2, 2), — a claim which Cicero justly characterizes as *et iniqua et nova.* In the year of Appius' consulship (B.C. 54), we have a propraetor, Pomptinius, demanding a triumph, which is opposed for the lack of the law under discussion: *negant latum de imperio, et est latum insulse* (Cic. ad Att. iv. 16, 12). Cicero adds, in amazement at Appius' hardihood: *Appius sine lege, suo sumptu, in Ciliciam cogitat.*

One is tempted to suspect that the embarrassment of the consuls of B.C. 54 was similar to that of B.C. 49, — the incompetency to hold the *comitia centuriata* without the formal grant of the *imperium.* It is certain that this was the difficulty with the consuls at Thessalonica. Dio says (41, 43) that they had consuls and a Senate of two hundred members, and a place consecrated for the auspices (*templum*), so that they might be reckoned to have the people and the city there, but for the lack of the *lex curiata* they could elect no magistrates. It is easy to see a distinction between the two acts, — the exercise of military command and the holding of the assembly for elections. The one was an absolute necessity in an emergency, such as might arise at any time, and could not be anticipated. If an enemy attacked the city before the *imperium* had been formally conferred upon the magistrates; if by any accident or disaster an army in a province was left without a legally qualified commander; in

Digitized by Google

neither of these cases could it be supposed that the safety of the state would be allowed to depend upon such a mere formality as the passage of this law had now come to be. The *comitia*, on the other hand, were part of the organic law, a necessary part of the constitutional machinery, not dependent in any way upon accident or emergency: it might therefore be held strictly to all the formal requirements of the law for its validity. It is easy to understand, therefore, that the military *imperium* might be exercised merely by the authority of the Senate, or by no formal authority at all; while the *comitia* could not be summoned unless all the formal conditions had been observed. There is no indication in the record that this consideration had any weight with Appius Claudius; but our information is very imperfect, and as it was clearly the governing consideration with the consuls of B.C. 49, it may very well have had weight at this time. The object of Memmius and Calvinus may have been, not merely to obtain the influence of the consuls in their behalf, but to secure for the consuls the formal right to hold the election.

Turning now from special cases to the question of legal obligation, we find the most positive statements of the absolute necessity of the act for the exercise of military authority in all its forms. Livy (v. 52, 15) uses the expression *comitia curiata, quae rem militarem continet.* Cicero's expression is even stronger: *consuli, si legem curiatam non habet, attingere rem militarem non licet* (de leg. agr. ii. 12, 30). In relation to this same agrarian law, which provides for ten commissioners, whose authority should be granted by a *lex curiata*, he says: *sine lege curiata nihil agi per decemviros posse* (11, 28), and adds that the law provides for the contingency of the *lex curiata* not being passed: *si ea* [*lex*] *lata non erit . . . tum ii decemviri eodem iure sint quo qui optima lege.* That is, the law creating the office, while conferring the *imperium* upon the commissioners (in the regular form, by a *lex curiata*), makes provision against a formal defect, which would nullify the purposes of the law, by giving their actions entire validity even in that case. It follows that without this provision

Digitized by Google

the failure to carry the law would make their action invalid. Again, in the year B.C. 56, the demagogue Clodius, being himself curule aedile, and engaged in prosecuting Milo, the champion of the Senate, contrived (no doubt through some tribune) to prevent the passage of the *lex curiata:* πρὶν γὰρ ἐκεῖνον τεθῆναι, says Dio (39, 19), οὔτ' ἄλλο τι τῶν σπουδαίων ἐν τῷ κοινῷ πραχθῆναι, οὔτε δίκην οὐδεμίαν ἐσαχθῆναι ἐξῆν. The purpose of Clodius, says Dio, was to keep up the confusion, ὅπως ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἀποροίη: what is significant for our argument is Dio's statement of the legal effects of the failure to pass the law.

But although the formal grant of the *imperium* was regarded as necessary for the exercise of military authority, it is a significant fact that under several circumstances it was regularly made, not by the *comitia curiata,* but by some other organ of the government. It may be questioned whether this was ever the case with the power to hold the centuriate *comitia;* but with the power to command the army, especially in the case of proconsuls, there are numerous single instances, and even classes of instances, in which this was the case. For example, in regard to the proconsul Quintus Fulvius, B.C. 211, the Senate voted: *cui ne minueretur imperium si in urbem venisset, decernit Senatus ut Q. Fulvio par cum consulibus imperium esset* (Liv. xxvi. 9. 10). Here the *imperium* was not granted, but the already existing *imperium* was elevated in rank. A better known case is that of Caesar Octavianus, to whom the Senate gave the *imperium* early in the year 43: *demus igitur imperium Caesari, sine quo res militaris administrari, teneri exercitus, bellum geri non potest* (Cic. Phil. v. 16, 45). But even the plebeian assembly of the tribes regularly granted the *imperium* on two occasions: first, to enable a victorious commander to retain the authority over his army within the city on the day of his triumph (Liv. xxvi. 21. 5. See Becker, *Alterthümer,* ii. 2, 66); secondly, in the more important case of a proconsul or propraetor who entered upon the government of a province after an interval of time since the expiring of his magistracy; *e.g.* Cicero's proconsulship in Cilicia, B.C. 51. In both these cases the *imperium* was con-

Digitized by Google

ferred by a *plebiscitum* (Mommsen, *Rechtsfrage zwischen Caesar und dem Senat*, p. 45, note). These cases prove not that no formal grant of the *imperium* was necessary, but that it might be made by some other authority than the *comitia curiata;* not, however, it would seem, for the purpose of holding the *comitia centuriata.*

The reason given by Cicero for the requirement of the law shows that it was regarded as, in its origin, not a bare and unessential formality, but a substantial grant of power. He says that its object was to give the people an opportunity to reconsider their action in the election of magistrates, implying that if they had elected an unfit person they could, at any rate, by refusing to pass this law, limit his power of doing mischief. *Maiores de singulis magistratibus bis vos sententiam ferre voluerunt. Nam cum centuriata lex censoribus ferebatur, cum curiata caeteris patriciis magistratibus, tum iterum de eisdem indicabatur, ut esset reprehendendi potestas, si populum beneficii sui paeniteret* (leg. agr. ii. 11, 26).

This view is supported by the account which he gives of the first historical example of the law, in the succession of Numa Pompilius to the kingly authority: *quamquam populus curiatis eum comitiis regem esse iusserat, tamen ipse de suo imperio curiatam legem tulit* (de rep. ii. 13, 25). The same action is ascribed to Tullus Hostilius (17, 31), Ancus Marcius (18, 33), and Tarquinius Priscus (20, 35).

Why this twofold action of the people was required (*cum maiores binis comitiis voluerint vos de singulis magistratibus indicare*, Cic. de leg. agr. ii. 11, 27) can be best understood if we look a little more closely at the fundamental institutions of the Roman state. King, Senate, and Popular Assembly are the three integral institutions naturally evolved in the progress of early society; but they are not always developed in the same degree or on the same lines. In Greece the king was the preponderant power, having an hereditary authority somewhat approaching that of oriental monarchs; among the Germans sovereignty, if we may use a modern term, resided in the popular assembly. The early Roman constitution, on the other hand, was essentially aristocratic,

Digitized by Google

the Senate being the controlling element.[1] This resulted from the peculiar structure of Roman society, in which the patriarchal authority of the father of the family, the *patria potestas*, was strained to a greater degree of rigor than in any other known society. I will not discuss the question whether, as Sir Henry Maine held, this Roman *patria potestas* was the original type, or, as the late Prof. Ernest Young argued, it was an exceptional form peculiar to the Romans; I will only say that Professor Young's arguments seem to me unanswerable. According to this *patria potestas*, however derived, the Roman *paterfamilias* was the only member of the family who had any status before the law; he was its absolute ruler and its sole proprietor. The assembly of these heads of family, the *patres*, was in a legal point of view the Roman people. This assembly, therefore, known as the Senate, or council of old men, was, in this stage of society, regarded as in absolute possession of the auspices, or the religious sanction upon which the state rested. This point of view was never lost out of sight through the whole period of the republic. Under all constitutional charges, and in spite of the ever-increasing disintegration of the patriciate, the patrician senators continued to be the source of all government, the body to whom all authority reverted whenever there was an interruption of the regular action of the governmental machinery. When this machinery *ran down*, as we may say, from a failure to elect the new magistrates in season, or from any other cause, as it did several times in the course of the last century of the republic, the patrician senators were the only authority competent to wind it up again. On the occurrence of an interregnum, the *interrex* was invariably a senator of patrician family.

Now with this fundamental principle of the Roman polity, by which the sovereignty belonged to the patrician Senate — an essentially aristocratic principle — the Romans associated two other principles of great practical importance, the one of a monarchical, the other of a democratic character. The first

[1] This point was first established by Rubino, in his *Untersuchungen über römische Verfassung und Geschichte.*

Digitized by Google

was the Roman practice of lodging in the hands of their magistrates for the time being the greatest fulness of executive authority of which we have record in any free state. The auspices belonged to the Senate, it is true, but their temporary possession, except in the case of an interregnum, was with the magistrates, and its exercise was practically unlimited during the term of office. The other principle, democratic in character, was that by which, in the duties and privileges of citizenship, the son *in potestate* was the full equal of the *paterfamilias.* The assembly of the people, the popular branch of the constitution, was composed of every man of fighting age — it was the army, convened for purposes of government. Thus, while the ultimate authority rested with the Senate, composed only of *patres*, or persons who were *sui iuris*, in the assembly the son had equal authority with his father, and was equally entitled to hold a magistracy.

If we put these three principles of the Roman constitution together — the original sovereignty of the Senate as the impersonation of the people; the concentration of authority in the hands of the magistrates; and the equality of all citizens of fighting age in political relations, — we shall see the purport of the *lex curiata de imperio.* The magistrate was first designated by the assembly, but the Senate, by its *patrum auctoritas*, had the right to refuse its sanction to the action of the people: next, the elected magistrate was inaugurated, and thus placed in possession of the auspices. The possession of the auspices made him for the time being the representative of the Senate as the impersonation of the State, and gave him authority to convene the Senate and the assembly of the curies. But the complete authority of the magistrate, the *imperium*, by virtue of which he could command the armies and condemn to death without appeal, — this authority he must receive by a special act: it must be formally conferred upon him, by the army which he was to command, the citizens over whom he was to have the power of life and death.

The question naturally occurs: if the *imperium* was granted by the army in its political capacity, why this function did

Digitized by Google

not along with the rest of the functions of the *comitia curiata* devolve upon the *comitia centuriata*, when this assembly became the principal assembly of the republic; for the *comitia centuriata* was primarily and distinctively a military organization. The reason is probably to be sought in the fact that the centuriate organization did not all at once supersede the curiate, but served for some time as the basis of the army before it was turned to political purposes. The centuriate organization, as established by Servius Tullius, served as a schedule for the military levy, but the citizens still continued to vote by curies, and of course to grant the *imperium* by a *lex curiata*. Then when, on the establishment of the republic, the *comitia centuriata* was made the regular organ of popular action, this special formality had become so completely associated with the *comitia curiata*, that it seemed necessary to retain that assembly for the sole purpose of its exercise. Or it may have been that the patricians, when they surrendered the right to elect magistrates to an assembly composed of both orders, kept in their own hands the power of conferring the *imperium*, by the exclusively patrician *comitia curiata*. Mommsen has proved, it is true, that the plebeians were admitted to the curies at some time, and suggests that this was done at the establishment of the republic, as one provision of the compromise then made between the orders. But this is only a suggestion, as there are no data that prove the admission of the plebeians to the *comitia curiata* until a considerably later time. It does not follow that membership of the curies necessarily carried with it at once the right to vote in their assembly. The curies, it should be noted, were not merely divisions of the patrician citizens, they were also divisions of the territory. The Italian peoples appear to have entered Italy with a tribal organization, consisting of *gentes*, or family groups. As is regularly the case with settlements made by nations at this social stage, these *gentes* settled by themselves, each in a district of its own: the *gentes*, originally purely personal divisions, thus became localized. As the curies were groups of *gentes*, and the tribes were divided into curies, it follows that these divisions were also local-

Digitized by Google

ized.[1] We have positive evidence of each of these facts. Of the local tribes, established by Servius Tullius, every one of the twenty earliest (with the exception of four city tribes) bore the name of a patrician *gens*, — a fact which is taken by Mommsen to prove that it received the name of the most prominent *gens* within its territorial limits. Of the curies and the tribes we have more explicit testimony. Of the curies, Dionysius Halicarnasensis says (ii. 17): *διελὼν τὴν γῆν εἰς τριάκοντα κλήρους ἴσους, ἑκάστῃ φράτρᾳ κλῆρον ἀπέδωκεν ἕνα.* Of the three patrician tribes Varro says (L. L. v. 55): *ager Romanus primum divisus in parteis tris, a quo tribus appellata Tatiensium, Ramnium, Lucerum.* These passages prove at least that, according to tradition, both tribes and curies occupied definite territorial areas. The plebeians were therefore by necessity residents of the districts which were associated with the several curies, and they appear to have made use of this organization for the election of their tribunes during the first years after the establishment of that office, until the more serviceable organization by tribes was established through the Publilian Law, B.C. 471.

To conclude: it appears that the *lex curiata de imperio* was regarded by the Romans as a substantial bestowal of power, designed in its origin to establish an effective check upon popular election, by reserving the highest executive function for a special grant, which in the republic was conferred by an assembly organized upon a different principle from that which made the election; in this respect having a certain analogy with our modern bi-cameral legislatures. Further, that even when it sank to a mere formality, it never came to be considered an unessential formality, but was looked upon as an act which must be secured in some way: that therefore in cases where the power was not conferred by this special act, some equivalent action (of Senate or Tribal Assembly) was nevertheless required; while for the assembling of the centuriate *comitia*, an integral organic act of the constitution, there is reason to believe that this specific act was indispensable.

[1] See Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, iii. 94.

Digitized by Google

II. — *On the Impersonal Verbs.*

By JULIUS GOEBEL, Ph.D.,
NEW YORK, N.Y.

The question concerning the origin and nature of the so-called impersonals is one of great interest to the philosopher as well as to the philologian, for it is here that logic and grammar meet to solve a problem which belongs to both of these sciences. The impersonals and the sentences formed on them seem to present an exception, if not a contradiction, not only to the syntactical rule that every sentence should consist of a subject and a predicate, but also to the law of logic, according to which a judgment is composed of two members. A linguistic investigation of this problem can, therefore, not be made without seeking aid from logic and psychology, and its results may help to throw light on the relation of grammar to logic and on the pyschological basis of language. We could, of course, proceed exclusively according to the historical method, inquiring after the origin of the impersonals in general as well as in particular. But such an investigation would equally need to be assisted by psychological and logical considerations, without which it would scarcely rise above a mere collection of material. Before we attempt, however, an explanation of this apparently irrational linguistic phenomenon we may do well to glance at the history of all the various attempts in the same direction. Considering the fact that the principal question concerning the impersonals has always been whether the sentences formed by them contain a subject or not, we can distinguish two schools of writers on this question: those who affirm the existence of a subject, and those who deny it.

The defenders of a subject contained in the impersonals may again be arranged into different classes, according to their claiming an indefinite or a definite notion to be the subject of these sentences.

Digitized by Google

That the indefinite notion forming the subject is contained in the verbal stem of the impersonal, we are assured by many grammarians. Thus *curritur* is to be explained: [*cursus*] *curritur*, an explanation which appears as far back as the grammarian Priscian, who says: "Cum dico *curritur*, *cursus* intelligo, et *sedetur sessio* et *evenit eventus*." It is obvious, however, that this explanation is not sufficient for all impersonals, and when I say: *es wird gespeist*, there cannot be any doubt as to what *gespeist wird*, *das Speisen*, the verbal stem, or *die Speise*, 'the food.' The indefinite notion may also be supplied by other means, as some grammarians think. In ὕει we can add Zeus, in συσκοτάζει we can supply ἡμέρα, and instead of *es fehlt an Geld*, we can say: *Geld fehlt*. But it would be very difficult to find a subject for every impersonal, and this lack of uniformity has especially displeased the philosophers who have tried to find an indefinite notion which would cover all cases. Many of them believe they have found it in the indefinite "Etwas," which they substitute for the German "es." Thus Ueberweg says: "Niemals kann einem Urtheil und Satze das Subject völlig fehlen, wohl aber kann die bestimmte Subjectsvorstellung fehlen und anstatt dessen das blosse *Etwas* (*es*) eintreten. In *es ist ein Gott*, *es gibt einen Gott* tritt die unbestimmt vorgestellte Totalität des Seienden oder ein unbestimmter Theil derselben als Subject ein, gleichwie auch in den Sätzen *es regnet*." Similar views are represented by Lotze, who says: "Wer ein impersonales Urtheil ausspricht, betrachtet den bestimmten Inhalt als haftend an einem unbestimmten Subject. Das *es* in *es blitzt* bezeichnet den allumfassenden Gedanken der Wirklichkeit, die bald so bald anders gestaltet ist." Prantl, Bergmann, Wundt, and Steinthal may also be named here as representatives of the same view, which we must regard as a product of philosophic speculation, but which has no support in the facts of common speech and thought.

Entirely antagonistic to this view is the opinion which holds that there is no subject contained in the impersonals. Dissatisfied with the attempts to find a subject, just mentioned, a number of logicians and grammarians regard the impersonal

Digitized by Google

as an exception in human speech, some going even so far as to require a revision of the laws of logic concerning the nature of the judgment. Among the philosophers we find Herbart and Trendelenburg doubting whether the impersonal really contains a judgment. Thus the former declares: "dass das Impersonale nicht als gewöhnliches Urtheil anzusehen sei," and Trendelenburg regards it as "ein unvollständiges Urtheil, ein Rudiment eines Urtheils." Not concerned about the logical consequences, grammarians like Heyse, Grimm, and Benfey have declared that the impersonals do not possess a subject. They were recently joined by Miklosich, whose book: "Subjectlose Sätze" caused the whole discussion to be opened again with renewed energy. His position was defended by A. Marty in an essay: "Ueber subjectlose Sätze und das Verhältniss der Grammatik zur Logik und Psychologie" in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie*, VIII. 56 ff. The results which Miklosich and Marty apparently had reached by their investigations were, however, attacked and refuted by W. Schuppe in an essay on "Subjectlose Sätze" in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*, and in the most interesting and instructive monograph by Sigwart: "Die Impersonalien, Eine logische Untersuchung."

A peculiar position between the two parties is occupied by Paul in his "Principien der Sprachgeschichte." Making a distinction between the psychological and the logical subject of a sentence, he ascribes the former to the impersonals while he denies the existence of the latter. We shall see, however, in the course of this paper, — which will attempt to supplement Sigwart's logical discussion by linguistic considerations, — that a complicated question like this cannot be settled by a few apodeictical remarks, as Paul seems to think. In view of the greater abundance of impersonals in the German language I shall take my illustrations mostly from that source.

The attempts at an explanation mentioned above are characterized by two modes of procedure, one of which we, too, might be tempted to adopt. It might be possible that the impersonals which have been preserved to us in the various languages were survivals of a prehistoric stage of syntactical

Digitized by Google

construction from which the present sentence had gradually developed. This is, however, shown to be a fruitless hypothesis by the single fact that the impersonals are constantly increasing, not to speak of the fact that we are entirely without means to prove such a development in the languages historically known to us. Having, therefore, to deal not with a prehistoric relic, but with a living linguistic phenomenon still capable, in the German at least, of new formations, we might also reduce the various impersonals to their common characteristics and construct upon these an hypothesis which would explain them. Since all impersonals agree in containing either a verb, — *e.g.* *ὕει, tonat, it lightens, es blitzt,* — or a noun or an adjective with the verb "to be," — *e.g. it is cold, es ist kalt,* — is it not possible to find a subject which would meet all cases, though it is not expressed?

It will be remembered that the philosophers especially have tried the latter method, without, however, reaching satisfactory results. For it has justly been remarked by Schuppe and Sigwart that a conclusion from that which has been expressed to that which was thought is not admissible, since many things which are thought do not or cannot find an expression in language. The want of an expressed subject in the impersonals is therefore not to be considered a proof of its existence or non-existence. But since we are constantly making use of impersonals, we are still in a position to observe the psychological process at the basis of this peculiar syntactic construction. An investigation into this psychological process may not only solve the problem concerning the real nature of the impersonal, but it may also furnish us with a key for the understanding of its origin in the various languages. There will not be any doubt that we meet in the impersonal the same psychic function which appears at the basis of all human speech; still, it may not be useless to repeat here a few fundamental facts.

We know that the picture of the world about us consists of representations caused by sense-impressions, representations which find their expression in the various words of the language. But before we can use a word, before we can indi-

Digitized by Google

cate to others certain mental representation, it is necessary that its meaning be known to the speaker as well as to the hearer, it is necessary that by association the word should have become the sign of the special representation. If I use the word "man," I imply that by previous sense-impressions the picture of the human form is present to my mind, and that this inner mental picture is closely connected with the word "man." Thus the words of a language present a vast number of representations which I can reproduce in others speaking the same language by the simple utterance of the words. But while I may thus in the hearer reproduce representations which he already possesses, I am unable to impart any new knowledge by such isolated words. The latter can be accomplished only if to the word used a relation to some other representation is added which is originally not contained in that word. It does not make any difference whether this relation is expressed by the speaker or not; for if it is not, it has to be supplemented by the hearer. When I pronounce the single word "March!" before this assembly, it will produce before your minds the representation of marching which you formerly have gained by looking at soldiers or free masons. If, however, I were to address a company of soldiers with the word "March!" the latter would have still another meaning beside the representation of the idea of marching. The soldiers would add the thought that I also meant the command to march. If the hearer is, however, not able to supplement by the situation the relation existing in my mind, it is necessary to express it. Hence it is evident that human speech, as far as it is a statement or the conveying of a judgment, necessarily must consist of two members at least, which grammar distinguishes as subject and predicate.

While we have thus deduced the fact that the logical judgment contained in every sentence implies the existence of a subject and a predicate, we have still to determine to what class of judgments the impersonals belong, in order to determine their subjects. This inquiry is facilitated by the character itself of the impersonals, which, as is generally conceded, express with a very few exceptions concrete perceptions.

Digitized by Google

Sigwart, in his Logic, has happily named the judgments expressing a synthesis of a perception made at the present moment with the representation I already had in my mind: "Benennungsurtheile." Such a judgment I express, *e.g.*, when I show a friend the city in which I live, and which he has never seen before, and pointing out to him the various buildings I say: "This is the cathedral; this is the court-house," etc. A similar synthesis, though the mental process is somewhat more complicated, is contained in judgments expressing a quality or an action of some object, as, *e.g.*, "the apple is green," or "the bird flies."

This process of synthesis takes place very easily where we have to deal with phenomena or objects which are accessible to our observation. It becomes, however, more difficult when the object or the phenomenon is removed from my direct observation, and I perceive only the quality or the action. If I notice, *e.g.*, in the twilight a red light in the distance without being able to discern the direct cause of it, I shall say in German: "dort glänzt etwas"; the latter word taking the place of the subject required by the custom of speech in such sentences. In many cases that part of the sentence which we call the predicate thus enters our consciousness first, and so we can understand why the Hebrew language, *e.g.*, usually places the predicate before the subject. And here we also find the explanation for the syntactical construction peculiar to the German language according to which the pronoun "es" precedes the real subject of the sentence. This "es," therefore, not only contains the consoling assurance that the speaker or writer will not leave us without a subject, but it reflects the secret logical power of the German idiom which demands a subject before the predicate. Sentences like "es lächelt der See," "es steht ein Baum," etc., are, however, not strictly impersonals, nor is the "es" necessarily required there. This can be seen from the early writings of Goethe, who, following the advice of Herder, left it out in many cases, as, *e.g.*, "Sah ein Knab ein Röslein stehn." Other instructive examples for the psychological origin of the impersonals are furnished by the sensa-

Digitized by Google

tions of hearing and of smell, which, without the aid of sight or touch, leave us in doubt as to their cause. And this uncertainty or indefiniteness, again, finds its expresssion by the pronoun "es," as, *e.g.*, in sentences like *es rauscht, es tönt, es riecht*, etc. Sigwart, in the monograph mentioned above, has proved conclusively, according to my opinion, that in all of these cases we have a synthesis of a subject and its qualities or actions, though the representation of the subject frequently may be confused, or we may for convenience' sake omit to express it.

There are, however, cases in which the representation of the subject is not only confused or indefinite, but absolutely obscure, and these examples have served as a proof to those who deny the existence of a subject in the real impersonals. Again, Schuppe, and especially Sigwart, have made it evident that in these impersonals the quality or the action which we notice without regard to the subject of their cause become the subject of the statement or judgment. Sigwart uses the following illustration: When I hear knocking at the door I know very well that somebody wishes to come in, and in case I wish to direct the attention to the cause of the knocking I shall say: "man klopft," "Jemand klopft." But when I say "es klopft," I simply wish to state that the noise which I heard was knocking, without regard to the knocker. It is evident from this that occurrences or conditions which make a sensual impression on us may themselves become the subject of a statement. Thus the impersonal *tonat* means nothing but the statement that it is thunder that I have just heard, and the pronoun "es" in the German *es donnert* has no other significance than that of the demonstrative "das" in the sentence "Das ist Donner." It is scarcely necessary to state that these impersonals present the same synthesis which Sigwart calls "Benennungsurtheile." Various classes of impersonals may be distinguished as belonging under this head, having psychologically originated in the same way. It is the idea of motion without regard to its direct cause which finds its expression in impersonals like *es wimmelt, es strömt nach dem Marktplatz*, etc. The same idea is expressed in

Digitized by Google

impersonals describing the movements of water or the ocean, as, *e.g.*, *es brandet*, *es tobt*, "es wallet und siedet und brauset und zischt." Another class of impersonalia belonging here is composed of those impersonals which are formed by the passive, and in which the insignificance of the pronoun "es" is made evident by its entire omission; *e.g.* "erst wurde gespielt, dann getanzt und schliesslich gespeist."

A third class of impersonals of the same logical character is formed by those which describe conditions of our body and soul; *e.g.* "es friert mich," "hungert mich," "*Es* ist mir, ich weiss nicht wie," "mir graut's," "mich drängt's," etc. We must look for the psychological origin of these impersonals in the fact that in the various states of feeling of which we become conscious we appear ourselves to be passive, and hunger, fear, wonder, etc., seem to attack us like hostile powers. The contradiction between the customary forms of language and the real state of affairs becomes quite evident in these cases. For the mere question: "Was hungert mich?" "dürstet mich?" "graut mir?" etc., for which there is no answer, shows the ridiculousness of the presumption that "es" took here the place of a subject. These impersonals simply make the statement that the state of being hungry, thirsty, etc., takes place in my particular case, as we can still see from the English equivalents "I am hungry," "I am thirsty," "I am afraid," etc. A similar logical and psychological process may be found in the impersonals referring to the weather, to the changes of day and night, of the seasons and other periods of time, all of which denote the taking place of a phenomenon in a certain space or at a certain period of time. In the impersonals "it rains," "it snows," "it hails," etc., the collective nature of the phenomenon, *i.e.* the mass of raindrops, snowflakes, etc., makes it impossible to speak of a single cause as being the subject of these sentences. It is, on the contrary, just this collective character of the phenomena which appears in the verbs of the impersonal sentences.

It is impossible to enter here into a discussion of those impersonals which express the idea of existence or of the opposite, the idea of want, of necessity, etc.

Digitized by Google

Against the assertions of Herbart and Brentano, Sigwart has proved conclusively that the idea of existence or non-existence asserted of an object must necessarily be considered a predicate, and that impersonals expressing this idea have to be regarded as logical judgments composed of the regular two members: subject and predicate. The only difference between these impersonals and those discussed before, consists in the difference of the process of thinking which is at the basis of both.

There can scarcely be any doubt that the same psychological and logical processes, which we can now still observe in the use of the impersonals, were also effective when they first originated. We have no reason to believe that the fundamental laws of human thinking, which found its expression in language, have been different from the modes practised at any early period. And the method of linguistic research, which throws light upon earlier formations of the language, by the investigation of present speech phenomena, should above all be applied in the case of the impersonals. From our previous discussion it will probably have resulted that in every case we have before us a logical judgment, consisting of the two necessary members, whether the subject is expressed or not. Our psychological considerations have, on the other hand, shown us how it was possible either to omit the statement of a subject entirely or to conceal under the indefinite pronoun "it," "es," "il," Sl. "vono," or the simple 3d per. sing. as in Latin and Greek. Taking for granted that words like "fire!" "murder!" "march!" in certain situations must be considered full sentences, we might suppose that forms like *pluit, tonat, ὕει, ἀστράπτει, βροντᾷ,* were originally used in a similar sense. But here the question arises, why was the 3d per. sing. chosen for this purpose, and not the infinitive which is really used in forms like *aufsitzen! laufen!* etc. It has been claimed that because in several languages the 3d per. sing. appears without an ending, the existence of such an ending in other languages was not sufficient proof of the existence of a subject. But whether it has an ending or not, some form of the verb must have been used for the 3d per.

Digitized by Google

sing. as long as human thinking makes a distinction between the first, second, and third person.[1]

Considering the concrete nature of the impersonals as well as the concrete nature of early human thinking, it seems to me that this mode of impersonal expression has gradually arisen from personal constructions. If we must consider the phenomena of nature as having had the greatest early influence upon the mental development of man, we may probably also look to them for the origin of the impersonal constructions. Glancing over the impersonals of the ancient languages, we find side by side with those describing natural phenomena such as are the result of most complicated psychological processes, as, *e.g.*, beside *ὕει*, *βροντᾷ*, *tonat*, *pluit*, etc., *χρή*, *δεῖ*, *oportet*, *vacat*, etc. But it must certainly be considered a remarkable fact that Homer, beside having very few impersonals, never uses *ὕει*, *βροντᾷ*, etc., without their subject Zeus; while Herodotus always substitutes *ὁ θεός*. We seem to be able to follow here the gradual disappearance of that imaginative mythological view of the world gradually making room for a more rationalistic mode of conception which finally, in the impersonals, leaves out the mythological subject as the originator of the frequent phenomena of nature. A similar course of development may also have taken place in the case of those impersonals whose subject, at an earlier stage, may also have been a mythological power; as, *e.g.*, in the impersonals expressing the idea of necessity and of development, Gr. *δεῖ*, *γίγνεσθαι*, Lat. *oportet*, *fit*, Goth. *vaírpan*, *skulan*. Having gradually omitted their original subject, and presenting only the 3d per. sing. of the verbal stem, these forms may easily have become the model for statements in which the phenomenon was vividly felt, while the cause was equally as obscure as it had become

[1] Tobler's remark on this point (*Literaturblatt für germ. und rom. Philologie*, IX. 388): "dass bei den Impersonalien, auch wenn sie von keinem Pronomen 'es' begleitet sind ein Subject in der Verbalendung enthalten sei, ist unrichtig, denn die Flexion dient mir dazu das Verbum überhaupt als lebendiges (finitum) zu bezeichnen," is unfounded and obscure. His whole review of Sigwart's excellent treatise is written from the one-sided standpoint of a linguist, which is rather remarkable in a scholar of Tobler's eminence.

Digitized by Google

in the case of the phenomena of nature. There is no reason to prevent us from supposing that conditions of feeling should now have suggested themselves quite easily, as we can see from the Latin "me pudet, piget, poenitet, taedet atque miseret." I know that I am here stepping upon the unsafe ground of hypothesis, but my supposition may gain probability by an analogy from the German. In Gothic we have comparatively very few impersonals agreeing in character with those of the Latin and Greek languages. But, while the religious nature of the Gothic literature makes it difficult to penetrate into the origin of these forms, we still find in the present impersonals referring to phenomena of nature mythological reminiscences similar to those in Latin and Greek. Such personifications are still to be noticed in a vague phantom-like form when speaking of the sky, "es bewölkt sich, klärt sich auf, es besinnt sich, ob es regnen will," or when describing a strong wind, we say, "es wüthet." More clearly, however, these conceptions appear in the language of the nursery, where the children still say: "der liebe Gott donnert, fährt mit seinem Wagen im Himmel, regnet." "Der wilde Jäger wüthet," etc. The Gothic shows that *rigngan*, to rain, is among its few impersonals, and this seems to make it probable that *rigneiþ*, 'it rains,' like *ὕει* and *pluit*, gradually lost its subject, and thus, together with similar expressions, became the model of the numerous impersonals of the present German. And is it not a strange fact that the Hebrew, *e.g.*, contains almost no impersonals, despite its inclination to begin the sentence with the predicate? This tendency offered sufficient logical and psychological reasons for the development of impersonal expressions, but it seems to me that, religious considerations forbidding mythological polytheistic personifications, there was not room for a development similar to that of other languages which ascribed these phenomena of nature to various deities.

In single cases of modern German impersonals we are still in the position of proving their origin from personal syntactic constructions. Thus we can see how the impersonals *es gibt*, *es gebricht*, were originally used with a subject in

Digitized by Google

their concrete sense, *i.e. geben* = 'produce,' *gebrechen* = 'having a break.' Gradually the idea expressed by the verbs became detached from a special subject, and by a process of abstraction they developed into impersonals.

If the theory is true that the impersonals have originated from a personal construction, there cannot be any doubt that the German pronoun "es" originally reflected the lost or omitted subject, but gradually degenerated into its present logical insignificance which we discovered above. J. Grimm (Wörterbuch, III. 412) seems to have recognized the former fact when saying: "Die Sprache bediene sich des dem Neutrum überhaupt eingepflanzten Begriffes der Unbestimmtheit, um das nur Andeutbare, *Unbekannte* oder *Geheime* zu bezeichnen." Sigwart has objected to the supposition that the neuter was especially fit to signify the "Unbekannte," since it was always used in common speech, "es" representing something known and definite. He is certainly right in holding that the neuter as such does not contain the idea which Grimm seems to find in it. There cannot be any doubt, however, that the poetical use of the impersonal and the pronoun "es" still reflects the reminiscence that "es" has taken place of something mysterious and unknown. And having taken this place, "es" assumes in itself the idea of the mysterious, the effect of which is very well known to poets. There is absolutely no means in the German language by which Goethe could have produced this effect in his celebrated "Hochzeitlied," describing the movements of the dwarfs: —

> "Da pfeift es und geigt es und klingt und klirrt
> Da ringelt's und schleift es und rauschet und wirrt
> Da pispert's und knistert's und flistert's und schwirt."

A similar instructive example of this poetical usage of the impersonals is furnished by Schiller's "Diver." Here, however, the more modern and abstract character of the impersonal prevails. In "es wallet und siedet und brauset und zischt," the accent is laid not so much on the mysterious "es," but rather on the various forms of action as described

Digitized by Google

by the verbs. I have found that the impersonal is strongly represented in lyric poetry since the sixteenth century. Of 352 popular songs in Uhland's collection, 60 begin with an impersonal; of 660 in Boehme's "Altdeutsches Liederbuch," 151 belong to the same class. A careful investigation of the poetic usage of the impersonal verb would certainly yield very interesting and important results concerning the character of the various poets, as well as the nature of the impersonal verbs themselves.

Digitized by Google

III. — *On the Authorship of the Cynicus of Lucian.*

By JOSIAH BRIDGE, Ph.D.,

NEW YORK, N.Y.

NEAR the end of our editions of Lucian is found a short dialogue between Lycinus and a Cynic in which the Cynic successfully defends the life of his school against the charges of Lycinus (*Cynicus*). There is a famous dialogue of Lucian's, the *Fugitivi*, whose main theme is an attack on the Cynics of Lucian's day. Fr. Fritzsche in his edition of Lucian (II. 2, p. 235 sq.) maintains that these two dialogues, so utterly at variance in their aims, could not have been written by the same author. Lucian wrote the *Fugitivi;* therefore Lucian did not write the *Cynicus.*

The aim of this paper is to show, first, that Fritzsche's inference that Lucian could not have written the *Cynicus* is incorrect; secondly, that Lucian did write the *Cynicus.*

To establish the first point it will only be necessary to call attention to Lucian's attitude towards Cynics and Cynicism. Bernays, in his well-known book on Lucian and the Cynics, holds that Lucian was entirely incapable of appreciating the Cynic life. He admits that in the Dialogues of the Dead Lucian shows some toleration of the older Cynics; but claims that the other Cynic dialogues from the *Vitarum Auctio* to the *Fugitivi* show evidence of a steadily growing hatred of the whole sect. In answer to this Vahlen (Index Lectionum, Berlin, 1882–3) has shown that the attitude of Lucian towards the old and true Cynics is throughout friendly, while to false Cynics of his own day he is the same bitter enemy that he is to the false philosophers of all schools. But I would go still farther than Vahlen, and maintain that to Lucian the highest type of philosophy was true Cynicism. Not merely do his life of Demonax, and his praise of Menippus and Diogenes throughout his works show this, but still more does a com-

Digitized by Google

parison between the seventh chapter of the *Trajectus* and the fifth of the *Fugitivi.* It is not denied that Cyniscus in the *Trajectus* represents the true Cynic philosopher. In the chapter mentioned Cyniscus asks Clotho through what fault of his he had been kept so long alive, and Clotho answers that she had left him designedly that he might be *ἔφορος καὶ ἰατρὸς τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἁμαρτημάτων.* In the *Fugitivi* is told how Zeus saw the world filled with crime and lawlessness and sent down Philosophy to be the physician of men's sins. That is, Zeus sent Philosophy down for precisely the same reason that Fate kept Cyniscus in life. There seems no reason for denying the conclusion that this ideal Cynic was to Lucian the ideal philosopher.

Fritzsche has tacitly assumed that to attack Cynics is to attack Cynicism. This can hardly be true. Unquestionably in the *Fugitivi* Lucian attacks most bitterly the mass of Cynics of his day, but he is careful to show that to him the mass of Cynics are false Cynics. It is noteworthy that in this very dialogue the philosophers who induced Philosophy when sorely grieved at the fate of her true votaries to remain on earth are all Cynics,—Antisthenes, Diogenes, Crates, and Menippus. These are old-time Cynics, it is true, but even in his bitterest attack Lucian, intentionally or not, suggests that there are true Cynics of his own day. Philosophy (c. 14) is speaking of the artisans that flock straight from the shops to her standard; each wrapped in his single cloak, with wallet on his back and staff in his hand (that is, in the Cynic garb), sees that to all intents he shall be on equal footing with the true philosophers, and that no one will distinguish them, if only their outsides be alike: that is, there are true Cynics of his own time whom these false ones can bring into disrepute. Such a true Cynic was Demonax. It is then not impossible that this author of the *Fugitivi* should have spoken in favor of true Cynics and of Cynicism.

Granting then that as far as its argument goes, Lucian might have written the *Cynicus,* what testimony about the authorship of the dialogue has its language to offer? At the very outset the Cynic is said *κόμην ἔχειν.* This was a great stum-

Digitized by Google

bling-block to Du Soul, who said[1] that the best writers in speaking of Cynics' hair always called them ἐν χρῷ κεκαρμένοι, "just as beyond question Cynics were"; but in our dialogue the Cynic is repeatedly (cc. 13, 16, 20) spoken of as having his hair long. All that remains, adds Du Soul, is to remind you that the work is spurious, and not worth further thought. Strangely enough, editors of Lucian since Du Soul's time have been content with repeating his note, or at least have added no word against it. Even Fritzsche has been led astray (ed. I. 2, p. 79, II. 2, 257). For there can be no doubt that in Lucian's time and earlier it was the custom of Cynics to wear their hair long. Tatian, the contemporary of Lucian (*Ad Graecos*, c. 25), describes philosophers who go about in long hair and full beards, with one cloak, with wallet and with staff, emulating dogs. We do not require the scholiast here to tell us that Cynics are meant. More interesting is the testimony of Dio Chrysostom, who paints the Cynic (ed. Dind. Vol. II., p. 245, l. 22) with but one cloak, with long hair on head and chin. This will do for testimony outside of Lucian, but this author himself in his account of Peregrinus' death (c. 15), says that Peregrinus, even before he had left the Christians, had adopted the Cynic garb: ἐκόμα δὲ ἤδη καὶ τρίβωνα πιναρὸν ἠμπείχατο καὶ πήραν παρήρτητο καὶ τὸ ζύλον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ ἦν. To support his note before cited Du Soul is compelled to consider the words ἐκόμα δὲ ἤδη corrupt, without cause, however, if, as is now plain, the Cynics of Lucian's day wore long hair. Grant this, and no one will deny that every word in the above description refers to the Cynic garb.

What, then, did Du Soul mean by saying that beyond all question Cynics were clipped to the skin? In his *Fugitivi* (c. 25) Lucian speaks of a Cynic, Cantharus, as having ἐν χρῷ κουρίαν. This passage Du Soul had in mind. But as this is the only passage of the sort yet found, it probably should receive a different interpretation from the one hitherto given it. Unquestionably it was the custom of the *Stoics* in Lucian's time to cut their hair close,—as Lucian states in the *Hermotimus* (c. 18),—and in the *Bis Accusatus* (c. 20) the Porch says of her-

[1] Edit. Lehm. IX., pp. 473-4.

Digitized by Google

self *ἐν χρῷ κέκαρμαι.* Cantharus then seems to have assumed a partly Stoic, partly Cynic dress, — nor can this seem strange if we recall what Hercules at the end of the dialogue says of him, "He said he was a Cynic down in Greece, but here in Thrace he is Chrysippus' man out and out, and soon you'll see him a Cleanthes, for the fellow shall hang from his beard" (c. 31, end). Cantharus, then, in the former passage is pictured as he was when captured in Thrace, a ridiculous mixture of the neat and trim Stoic and the frowzy Cynic. At all events, Fritzsche is wrong in stating (ed. II. 2, p. 257) that in Thrace Cantharus had discarded the Cynic habit by growing his hair and cutting off his beard: in that case how could Hercules say *κρεμήσεται ἀπὸ τοῦ πώγωνος?*

Therefore against Du Soul's argument we may now say, in *no* place in any author before or during Lucian's time is short hair mentioned as a characteristic of the Cynic's costume; but in several places, as in the *Cynicus,* Cynics are called long-haired.

But there are other difficulties in the way of the belief that Lucian wrote the *Cynicus.* In this book alone of all those under his name which speak expressly of the Cynic dress there is nowhere a mention either of the wallet or of the staff; though in Lucian we recognize a Cynic more by his staff and wallet than by his hair. But by far the greatest difficulty is in the style of the *Cynicus.* The most careless reader is struck by the frequency of repetition of the first word in a clause, a peculiarity of diction utterly at variance with Lucian's style. Thus, in c. 5, the gods' gifts are so plentiful *ὡς ἔχειν μὲν ἡμᾶς σιτία παντοδαπά, ἔχειν δὲ ποτὸν ἡδύ, ἔχειν δὲ χρήματα, ἔχειν δὲ εὐνὴν μαλακήν, ἔχειν δὲ οἰκίας καλάς,* or in c. 8, *σκόπει γὰρ τὸν πολύευκτον χρυσόν, σκόπει τὸν ἄργυρον, σκόπει τὰς ἐσθῆτας τὰς ἐσπουδασμένας, σκόπει τὰ τούτοις ἀκόλουθα πάντα πόσων πραγμάτων ἐστὶν ὤνια, πόσων πόνων, πόσων κινδύνων μᾶλλον δὲ αἵματος καὶ θανάτου καὶ διαφθορᾶς ἀνθρώπων πόσης.* Similar is the repetition of *σχῆμα καὶ στολή* in c. 16. The frequent use of *ποικίλος καὶ παντοδαπός* is also surprising for Lucian, although this phrase is found once in the *Nigrinus* (c. 36).

Digitized by Google

The question, then, reduces itself to this: Shall we, on account of these peculiarities of language, declare the *Cynicus* spurious, or is Lucian imitating some one both in style and argument?[1] Such imitation certainly is found in other places in Lucian, as in the ranting of the quack philosopher Thrasycles at the end of the *Timon*, and in the book and conversation of *Lexiphanes*. Yet if Lucian is imitating some one, who is the man? We might with Richard assume it to be some Cynic famous for the day whose name is lost. But the resemblance of our Cynic to a greater man is striking enough to demand consideration. Dio Chrysostom, who, as he himself tells us,[2] had adopted the Cynic's costume, devotes his 72d Oration to the discussion of this dress. Dio thinks it strange that all who assume that garb are handled so contemptuously by the masses, especially when in their temples they see the statues of Zeus and Poseidon and many other gods in just such a dress, although among some of the barbarians the style of dressing the gods is different. This is precisely the argument of the last section of the *Cynicus*, so that one on reading the two works can readily believe that the author of the *Cynicus* had the passage of Dio in mind. But Dio does not merely forestall the Cynic in his defence; he also adopts a similar line of attack, although at the end of his oration he adds what the Cynic nowhere asserts, that merely the dress of Diogenes cannot make Diogenes himself.

I believe that Lucian wrote the *Cynicus* with the same design with which he wrote the *Piscator*. In the latter book he wished not to recant but to explain what he had said in the *Vitarum Auctio*. In the *Cynicus* his chief intent was to show that what he had hitherto been attacking in the Cynics was not their dress nor their life of self-denial. Such a life he has elsewhere praised in the first chapter of the *Demonax*. Probably Lucian thought this explanation due to such a man as Dio Chrysostom, who not only had adopted the dress of the Cynics, but like Demonax, before all others revered Socrates

[1] Cf. Richard, *Ueber die Lykinosdialoge des Lukian*, Hamburg, 1886, pp. 33 sqq.

[2] Cf. Ed. Dind. II., p. 246, l. 3, and p. 250, l. 23, w. II., p. 22, l. 22 sq.

Digitized by Google

(*Or.* 60) and admired Diogenes (*Orr.* 4, 6, 8, 9, 10), who with the Cynics thought Philosophy nothing else than *τὸ ζητεῖν καὶ φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ὅπως τις ἔσται καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός* (*Or.* 13, Dind. I. 249, 14), who, like a Cynic, praises the *αὐτάρκεια* of Diogenes (*Or.* 6), though while he strongly favored true Cynicism, his verdict on the mass of Cynics of his day was the same as Lucian's (Ed. Dind. I. 402, 28). Above all, the style of Dio resembles our *Cynicus.* In his third oration he says (Dind. I. 51, 12) *ψυχὴ δὲ . . . πολλὰ πάσχει, ῥυομένη μὲν ἐκ νόσων τὸ σῶμα, ῥυομένη δ' ἐκ πολέμων, ῥυομένη δ' ἐκ χειμῶνος ῥυομένη δ' ἐκ θαλάττης,* and in this same oration there are twenty-four instances of similar repetition. The use of *ποικίλος καὶ παντοδαπός* is frequent enough to be of itself noticeable, and we find in the first oration a use of *σχῆμα καὶ στολή* similar to the use in the *Cynicus* (I. 11, 18). It must be admitted that Dio nowhere calls himself a Cynic; but he nowhere calls himself a philosopher of any school. It might be noted here that the word "Cynic" nowhere occurs in the text of the *Cynicus.* The fact, too, that in the *Cynicus* there is no mention of wallet or staff agrees so well with Dio's description of his own dress as to account for the omission. Besides, under Dio's mask Lucian could best preach against the vices of his own times; for, as Philostratus says (*Vit. Soph.* I. 7), most excellent in Dio's orations is *ἡ τοῦ ἤθους κρᾶσις.* And this attack is the secondary aim of the *Cynicus* (cf. Wieland, III. 147 sq.). Nor is it strange that in this as in his other dialogues the author shows a laughing face from his mask. For "ridentem dicere verum | Quid vetat?" Certainly to raise a laugh was not his only motive.

Lucian expressly mentions Dio only twice, first in *Peregrinus* (c. 18), where he is said to have won much fame from his exile. The second passage is the second chapter of the *Parasitus,* where the Parasite says, if you should call him by the title Parasite you would gratify him as much as you would Dio by dubbing him Philosopher. It is disputed what Dio is here meant, the more common view being that of Wieland and Lehmann, who think him some insignificant contemporary aspirant to the title. But Lucian's words fit so well

Digitized by Google

Dio Chrysostom's own statement about himself that there is good ground for believing Chrysostom is meant. In his 13th Oration Dio tells how, when he wandered from land to land in his Cynic dress, some called him vagabond, others beggar, others still philosopher. Most of the so-called philosophers assume that title themselves, *ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων λεγόντων οὐκ ἐδυνάμην ἀεὶ καὶ πᾶσι διαμάχεσθαι* (Dind. I. 243, 28). This coy method of consenting to the title is very much that of a man who, above all things, would be gratified at hearing it from another's lips.

That Lucian and his hearers should be so intimately acquainted with Dio's writings as the Cynic's parody supposes is not at all surprising, when we remember that Dio was not only a philosopher; he was by far the most illustrious rhetorician of his time, as is proved by his name, Chrysostom, and by the eulogy of Lucian's contemporary Philostratus (*Vit. Soph.* I. 7), who compares him with Demosthenes and Plato. And there could be no doubt that he was at that time a model to all aspirants to rhetorical fame, even if we had not the express testimony of Philostratus that this was true in the case of Aelian (*Vit. Soph.* II. 31, 1), and of Hippodromus (II. 27, 10).

If, on the other hand, we decide that the work is spurious, we can hardly suppose that it was the writer's object to pass off the book as one of Lucian's. For the variations from Lucian's style are too much on the surface, nor is it probable that any imitator would be guilty of so many un-Lucianic repetitions. But if the writer's object were, as Bernays supposes, to defend the same Cynics that Lucian attacks, among so many mentions of the Cynic costume should we not expect to find what Lucian especially notes, — the wallet and staff with the single cloak, rather than the habit that Dio wore? The fact that the name of the Cynic's opponent is Lycinus compels us, if we conclude that the dialogue is spurious, to adopt one of these two views. As it is, the book is found in the manuscripts of Lucian, which of itself is ground enough for holding it Lucian's unless very weighty reasons oppose. To me such reasons do not exist.

Digitized by Google

IV. — *The "Continued Allegory" in the First Book of the Faery Queene.*

By J. ERNEST WHITNEY,
INSTRUCTOR IN YALE UNIVERSITY.

SPENSER has not received from scholars the attention which has been given to the other great English poets. The so-called Spenserian Society has done almost nothing of the finer work which has characterized the Chaucer, Shakspere, Shelley, and Browning Societies. Yet, if we may judge from certain signs of the times, there is reason to hope for an early revival of general interest in the father of poets; for as truly as Chaucer is the father of English poetry, Spenser is the father of English poets. There is as much to be done for Spenser as there was for any of the great names written above. Consider, for instance, how that rich field, the Allegory of the Faery Queene, has been neglected. Sir Walter Scott, reviewing Todd's Spenser, asks why it is that editors do not see the need of giving their chief attention to its interpretation. Only a few Spenserians have been more than half friendly to it. Most critics, finding it as difficult to cope with as one of Spenser's dragons, have counselled the reader to let it alone. The absurdity of advice which entirely ignores a main object of the poet, ought to be apparent, and moreover the allegory is a chief element in the greatness of the Faery Queene. I do not believe it was regarded with indifference in Elizabethan days; that it is so treated now, in spite of differences in taste, is a deplorable commentary on English scholarship.

The difficulties in seeking the solution and explanation of Spenser's allegory are alluring rather than discouraging. It is easy enough to fancy constellations in the heavens, and since there was no apparent design in the grouping of the stars, the Arab's constellation is as good as the Scandinavian's.

Digitized by Google

Ursa Major, Big Dipper, Charles' Wain, Septentriones, — one figure is as correct as the other. So it is easy to fancy allegories for any imaginative tale like the Faery Queene. Indeed, it has been said that in Tasso's early work the allegory was purely an ingenious afterthought, put in, or worked out, without a change in his poem. With Spenser the case was entirely different. He made the allegory a chief study from the first, and a right and a wrong, a true and a false, interpretation is possible. Picking out the allegory of the Faery Queene, then, is like trying to recover lost constellations; and if you do not find them, you at least have been gazing on the glory of the stars and into the depth of the heavens, so that you go away with a new sense of appreciation and love for the maker of it all. If the student ever bears in mind Ruskin's words, "The Faery Queene like Dante's Paradise is only half estimated, because few persons take the pains to think out its meaning. . . . No time devoted to profane literature will be better rewarded than that spent earnestly on Spenser," the search through Spenser's mazy labyrinth affords one of the best exercises for wit and judgment.

Spenser's letter to Sir Walter Raleigh, which serves as a general introduction to the poem, recognizes the student's difficulties in the very first sentence.

"Sir, Knowing how doubtfully all Allegories may be construed, and this booke of mine, which I have entituled the Faery Queene, being a continued Allegorie, or darke conceit, I have thought good, as well for avoyding of jealous opinions and misconstructions, as also for your better light in reading thereof, (being so by you commanded) to discover unto you the generall intention and meaning, which in the whole course thereof I have fashioned, without expressing of any particular purposes, or by accidents, therein occasioned."

But the letter seems rather to stimulate than to satisfy curiosity. And undoubtedly the hints there given were more helpful to the Elizabethan than to later readers. Be that as it may, it is all we get from the poet or his contemporaries in the way of external comment; and in the mind of the allegory's author no further external comment is needed, as

Digitized by Google

one would think from these lines from the introduction to Book II.:

> "Of Faerie Lond yet if he more inquire,
> By certaine signes, here sett in sondry place,
> He may it find: ne let him then admire,
> But yield his sence to bee too blunt and bace,
> That no'te without an hound fine footing trace."

Now although the allegory may have been made designedly puzzling in the first place, and is now grown still more confusing, its solution is not hopeless. More than a hundred years ago, Upton regained many of its lost threads, and left his work with the conviction that he had made only a beginning. "Spenser," he says, "in his letter to Sir Walter Raleigh, tells us his poem is one continued allegory: Where therefore the moral allusion cannot be made apparent, we must seek, (as I imagine) for an historical allusion; and always we must look for more than meets the eye or ear; the words carrying one meaning with them and the secret sense another." In later years, Scott and the elder Disraeli have given useful, though rather obvious hints as to the "secret sense," and at least three attempts have been made to unfold the "continued allegory" of the First Book. The first of these, by Frank Howard, was published in "Notes and Queries," 3d series, vol. 4th, p. 283. The second, by the distinguished Thomas Keightly, was published in "Notes and Queries," 4th series, vol. 7th, p. 1. The third is given by Ruskin in "Stones of Venice," vol. 3d, p. 225. The first two interpretations are incongruous, improbable, unnatural, and cumbersome; they have never been accepted by scholars. Ruskin's comment is characteristically interesting and is valuable so far as it goes.

No one, so far as I have been able to examine Spenseriana, has called attention to the remarkable allegory of the "Defender of Faith" running throughout the First Book of the Faery Queene. I wish to show how conspicuous it is, and the particular reason why so much is made of it. The allegory, both moral and historical, is an important one. It is, I believe, pre-eminently the "continued allegory" of the poem.

Digitized by Google

In the adventures of the Red Cross Knight in the First Book, there is not an incident which is not plainly marked with it. There are clues to it everywhere. It is obscure only as those large names on maps are the hardest to find. In some parts of the allegory, previously accepted explanations of details are used, for here and there single letters, as it were, have been noticed on the map, though the whole legend of which they form a part has not been spelled out before. In a paper like this, the allegory can only be given circumstantially. To unfold it in detail as Spenser does, the poem should be edited with that object in view. In explaining, I will follow Spenser's method by reserving the most striking features to the last.

Every one remembers the opening lines of the Faery Queene:

> "A gentle Knight was pricking on the plaine,
> Ycladd in mightie armes and silver shielde,
> Wherein old dints of deepe wounds did remaine,
> The cruel markes of many a bloudy fielde;
> Yet armes till that time did he never wield.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> And on his brest a bloudie crosse he bore,
> The deare remembrance of his dying Lord,
> For whose sweete sake that glorious badge he wore,
> And dead as living ever him ador'd:
> Upon his shield the like was also scor'd,
> For soveraine hope, which in his helpe he had."

This armor, Spenser tells us, is that celestial panoply described by St. Paul in Ephesians, "Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness, and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all taking the shield of faith, wherewithal ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked; and take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

Notice that although St. Paul particularizes each piece of armor, Spenser, by generalizing all but one piece, thus gives

Digitized by Google

special emphasis to the shield of Faith:—twice in the first fourteen lines of the poem. It is according to Spenser's method to make much of particular pieces of armor. For example, it is by his shield that Prince Arthur overcomes Orgoglio in the eighth canto of the first book. The shield of Britomart is an allegorical symbol, and the shield of Scudamour (Scud d'amour) is made of signal importance in the tenth canto of the fourth book. Furthermore in the latter stanzas of the eleventh canto of the fifth book this same shield of the Red Cross Knight is plainly used as the symbol of the Christian faith. This is one of Spenser's "certain signs." Think for a moment of the ideas and sentiments which cluster about the shield! More than any other piece of armor it was something to be defended to the uttermost. The loss of it brought the deepest disgrace. "Come home with your shield, or on it" was the parting injunction of the Spartan mother. The shield of Faith proves to be the Knight's Defence and care in a peculiar sense, and he is the Defender of Faith as truly as he is the Defender of Una, or Truth.

Though Spenser usually moves with abundant leisure, he loses no time in opening the first book. No sooner are the knight and lady before us than "the day with clouds was suddeine overcast" and "an hideous storme" drives them to take refuge in the Wood of Error; there after wandering the labyrinth about they come to the den of the Dragon Error. To my mind this tempest represents the beginning of the Reformation. Certainly all agree on interpretation of references to the early Reformation in stanzas immediately following. At that time when old trusted supports were withdrawn and the very foundations of Christianity seemed crumbling, faith was tried as never before. Even with Una and the Dwarf, or Truth and Prudence, for guides, it was impossible for the Christian Knight to avoid all paths of error. But when error takes the substantial form of a Dragon the Knight can attack it and aims a good stout blow at the monster.

Digitized by Google

"Much daunted with that dint her sence was dazd;
Yet kindling rage her selfe she gathered round,
And all attonce her beastly body raizd
With doubled forces high above the ground:
Tho wrapping up her wrethed sterne arownd,
Lept fierce upon his shield, and her huge traine
All suddenly about his body wound,
That hand or foot to stirre he strove in vaine:
God helpe the man so wrapt in Errours endlesse traine.

"His lady sad to see his sore constraint,
Cried out, Now now Sir Knight, shew what ye bee,
Add faith unto your force, and be not faint:
Strangle her, else she sure will strangle thee.
That when he heard, in great perplexitie,
His gall did grate for griefe and high disdaine,
And knitting all his force got one hand free,
Wherewith he grypt her gorge with so great paine,
That soone to loose her wicked bands did her constraine."

Notice that it is the shield of faith which Error attacks, and would wrest away, and "her huge traine all suddenly about his body wound" reminds one of St. Paul again: not "having your loins girt about with truth," but with error. And as his faith is attacked, so it is his faith which Una seeks to strengthen, —

"Add faith unto your force, and be not faint:
Strangle her, else she sure will strangle thee."

Then after no easy struggle with that "sword of the Spirit which is the word of God," he

"Stroke at her with more than manly force
That from her body full of filthie sin
He raft her hateful head without remorse."

Though the Red Cross Knight has shown himself "well worthie of that armory," they are still in the wood of error, but they are now conscious of it. Spenser teaches us that even out of error there is a "plaine beaten path," but it is a direct retreat.

Digitized by Google

Without the interval of a single stanza Spenser passes from this adventure to a more subtle trial of faith.

> "At length they chaunst to meet upon the way
> An aged sire, in long blacke weedes yclad
> His feete all bare, his beard all hoarie gray,
> And by his belt his book he hanging had;
> Sober he seemde, and very sagely sad."

This holy hermit is Archimago, representing hypocrisy in the moral allegory, and the subtle intrigue and trickery of the Roman Catholics in the historical allegory. It is not strange that faith is credulous and the eye of truth deceived, since

> "Neither man nor angel can discern
> Hypocrisy, the only evil that walks
> Invisible except to God alone."

Since the day is spent they accept his proffered hospitality, and enter that never-to-be-forgotten home of Hypocrisy.

> "A little lowly hermitage it was,
> Down in a dale, hard by a forests side,
> Far from resort of people, that did pass
> In travell to and froe: a little wyde
> There was a holy chappell edifyde."

While his guests are sleeping Archimago with dreams and delusions of sense attacks the Knight's faith in the purity of Una, — the Christian's faith in the purity of truth itself. But even in dreams the Red Cross Knight would not in a single thought do Una wrong.

> "When those accursed messengers of hell,
> That feigning dreame, and that faire-forged spright,
> Came to their wicked maister, and gan tell
> Their booteless paines, and ill-succeeding night:
> Who all in rage to see his skilfull might
> Deluded so, gan threaten hellish paine
> And sad Proserpines wrath, them to affright,
> But, when he saw his threatening was but vaine,
> He cast about, and searcht his baleful bookes again."

Digitized by Google

He attacks his waking senses with a still more fiendish plot than any tried, and the delusion of the arch-magician is triumphant. The Knight's faith in Una, in the heavenly truth, is overcome, and convinced of her utter baseness, he spurs away deserting her. It will be well for future understanding of the allegory to remember that Una is veiled, and the Knight has never seen the real face of Una.

Not long has he ridden before another test of faith begins.

> "Still flying from his thoughts and gealous feare,
> At last him chaunst to meet upon the way
> A faithless Sarazin all arm'd to point,
> In whose great shield was writ with letters gay
> Sans foy: full large of limbs and every joint
> He was, and cared not for God or man a point.
>
> "Hee had a faire companion of his way,
> A goodly lady clad in scarlot red,
> Purfled with gold and pearle of rich assay,
> And like a Persian mitre on her hed
> Shee wore, with crowns and owches garnished,
> The which her lavish lovers to her gave;
> Her wanton palfrey all was overspred
> With tinsell trappings, woven like a wave,
> Whose bridle rung with golden bels and bosses brave."

So the Red Cross Knight meets Sansfoy, the faithless, the infidel, and Duessa, the opposite of Una, falsehood as opposed to truth. She typifies the papal church, with scarlet robes, and Persian mitre, and gifts of lavish lovers, contrasted with the spotless and sober simplicity of the reformed church. The Defender of Faith at once meets the attack of the Defender of Faithlessness shield to shield.

> "The flashing fier flies,
> As from a forge out of their burning shields,
> And streams of purple bloud new dies the verdant fields."
>
> "Curse on that Cross, (quoth then the Sazarin,)
> That keeps thy body from the bitter fit;

Digitized by Google

Dead long ygoe I wote thou haddest bin,
Had not that charme from thee forwarned it:
But yet I warne thee now assured sitt,
And hide thy head. Therewith upon his crest
With rigor so outrageous he smitt,
That a large share it hewd out of the rest,
And glauncing down, his shield from blame him fairly blest.

"Who, thereat wondrous wroth, the sleeping spark
Of native virtue gan eftsoones revive;
And at his haughty helmet making mark,
So hugely stroke that it the steel did rive,
And cleft his head. He tumbling downe alive,
With bloudy mouth his mother earth did kis,
Greeting his grave: his grudging ghost did strive
With the fraile flesh; at last it flitted is,
Whither the soules doe fly of men that live amis."

One cannot fail to notice the importance of the outward symbols of faith in this contest. The charmed shield with its red cross alone stands between the Knight and defeat, and even under the last fierce stroke of the infidel, aimed at his helmet, his very salvation, it fairly blesses him from blame. The Knight's blow returned upon the crest of Sansfoy proves it to be a helmet of destruction. What is the outcome of this combat?

Bidding his Dwarf to bring away

"The Sarazins shield, signe of the conqueroure,"

he rides on with Duessa, lending sympathetic and credulous attention to her long story made up of lies and lamentations. Her words deceive him, not only as to her nature but as to her name.

"In this sad plight, friendlesse, unfortunate,
Now miserable I Fidessa dwell,
Craving of you in pitty of my state
To do none ill, if please ye not do well,
He in great passion all this while did dwell,
* * * * * *
And said, Faire lady, hart of flint would rew
The undeserved woes and sorrowes which ye shew."

Digitized by Google

Thus Duessa, the deceitful, represents herself as Fidessa or true Faith. Henceforth for a time he believes himself to be the champion of faith, and his sincerity of purpose is not weakened as long as he does not know that Fidessa is the representative of false faith. Notice the names of the chief characters in this first book: Sansfoy is plainly *without faith:* Fidessa does not imply utter lack of faith, but *little faith.*

The next episode gives him opportunity to see what strait he is in by comparing the faith of Fradubio, or Brother Doubt, wavering between the true Fraelissa and the false witch Duessa, with his own conduct toward Una and the same Duessa. But it is not strange that all is lost upon him, since, as Upton says, "He stands amazed and performs nothing; for holiness, unassisted with truth and reason, is soon lost in amazement and silly wonderment."

In the next adventure, —

> "To sinfull house of Pride, Duessa
> Guides the faithful Knight."

It is

> "A stately pallace built of squared bricke,
> Which cunningly was without morter laid,
> Whose wals were high, but nothing strong, nor thick,
> And golden foile all over them displaid,
> That purest skye with brightnesse they dismaid:
> High lifted up were many loftie towres,
> And goodly galleries far over laid,
> Full of faire windowes and delightful bowres;
> And on the top a diall told the timely houres.
>
> "It was a goodly heape for to behould,
> And spake the praises of the workman's wit;
> But full great pittie, that so faire a mould
> Did on so weake foundation ever sit:
> For on a sandie hill, that still did flit
> And fall away, it mounted was full hie,
> That every breath of heaven shaked it:
> And all the hinder parts, that few could spie,
> Were ruinous and old but painted cunningly."

Digitized by Google

Here we have that contrast between the real and the apparent which characterizes Spenser's representations of the church he hated, and here false faith and true defender are welcomed. The queen of this palace, whose kingdom is everywhere, is Lucifera, worldly or ostentatious pride; and Vanity is the usher who leads all subjects "to the lowest staire of her high throne." For one thing Duessa typifies that form of self-deceit which breeds self-righteousness. The meaning of the moral allegory is obvious. Since he forsook Truth, the Red Cross Knight has lost simplicity and nobility of character, and at the House of Pride we find him following in the train of the seven deadly sins, — Pride, Sloth, Gluttony, Lechery, Avarice, Envy, Wrath.

> "And after all, upon the wagon beame
> Rode Sathan with a smarting whip in hand."

Here again he has to do battle for his faith:

> "An errant knight in armes ycled,
> And heathnish shield, wherein with letters red
> Was writt Sans joy they new arrived find:
> Enflam'd with fury and fiers hardy-hed,
> He seemed in hart to harbour thoughts unkind,
> And nourish bloudy vengeaunce in his bitter mind.
>
> "Who, when the shamed shield of slaine Sans foy
> He spied with that same Faery champions page,
> Bewraying him, that did of late destroy
> His eldest brother, burning all with rage
> He to him leapt and that same envious gage
> Of victor's glory from him snatcht away:
> But th' elfin knight, which ought that warlike wage,
> Disdained to loose the meed he wonne in fray,
> And him recountring fierce, reskewd the noble pray.
>
> "Therewith they gan to hurtlen greedily,
> Redoubted battaile ready to darrayne,
> And clash their shields and shake their swords on hy,
> That with their sturre they troubled all the traine;
> Till that great Queene, upon eternall paine

Digitized by Google

Of high displeasure that ensewen might,
Commanded them their fury to refraine;
And if that either to that shield had right,
In equall lists they should the morrow next it fight."

In the moral allegory the attack of Sansjoy is the attack of joylessness or despondency upon the victim of pride, self-righteousness, and false faith; and again a marked feature of the passage is the importance of the shield symbols. In the interval before the combat Duessa turns traitor, and warns Sansjoy that his opponent

"Beares a charmed shield,
And eke enchanted armes that none can perce;
Ne none can wound the man, that does them wield."

In the fight which follows, the allegory still turns on the trial of faith. The lists are set with royal pomp. Lucifera and her court are in attendance on one side.

"On th' other side in all mens open vew
Duessa placed is, and on a tree
Sans foy his shield is hangd with bloudy hew;
Both those the lawrell girlonds to the victor dew.

"A shrilling trompett sownded from on hye,
And unto battaill bad themselves addresse:
Their shining shieldes about their wrestes they tye,
And burning blades about their heades doe blesse,
The instruments of wrath and heavinesse.
With greedy force each other doth assayle,
And strike so fiercely, that they do impresse
Deep dinted furrows in the battred mayle:
The yron walles to ward their blowes are weak and fraile.

"The Sarazin was stout and wondrous strong,
And heaped blows like yron hammers great;
For after bloud and vengeance he did long:
The knight was fiers, and full of youthly heat,
And doubled strokes, like dreaded thunders threat;
For all for praise and honor he did fight.
Both stricken stryke, and beaten both doe beat,
That from their shields forth flyeth firie light,
And helmets hewen deepe shew marks of eithers might.

Digitized by Google

"At last the Paynim chaunst to cast his eye,
His suddein eye flaming with wrathful fyre,
Upon his brothers shield, which hong thereby:
Therewith redoubled was his raging yre,
And said Ah! wretched sonne of wofull syre,
Doest thou sit wayling by blacke Stygian lake,
Whylest here thy shield is hangd for victors hyre?
And, sluggish german, doest thy forces slake
To after-send his foe, that him may overtake?

"Goe, caytive Elfe, him quickly overtake,
And soone redeeme from his long-wandring woe:
Goe, guiltie ghost, to him my message make,
That I his shield have quit from dying foe,
Therewith upon his crest he stroke him so,
That twise he reeled, readie twise to fall:
End of the doubtfull battaile deemed tho
The lookers on; and lowd to him gan call
The false Duessa, Thine the shield, and I, and all!

"Soone as the Faerie heard his lady speake,
Out of his swowning dreame he gan awake;
And quickning faith, that earst was woxen weake,
The creeping deadly cold away did shake;
Tho mov'd with wrath, and shame, and ladies sake,
Of all attonce he cast aveng'd to be,
And with so' exceeding furie at him strake,
That forced him to stoupe upon his knee:
Had he not stouped so, he should have cloven bee.

"And to him said, Goe, now, proud miscreant,
Thyselfe thy message do to german deare;
Alone he, wandring, thee too long doth want:
Goe, say, his foe thy shield with his doth beare.
Therewith his heavie hand he high gan reare,
Him to have slaine; when lo! a darksome cloud
Upon him fell; he no where doth appeare,
But vanisht is. The Elfe him calls alowd,
But answer none receives: the darkness him does shroud.

Digitized by Google

"Not all so satisfide, with greedie eye
He sought, all round about, his thirstie blade
To bathe in bloud of faithless enemy;
Who all that while lay hid in secret shade:
He standes amazed how he thence should fade:
At last the trumpets triumph sound on hie;
And running heralds humble homage made,
Greeting him goodly with new victorie;
And to him brought the shield, the cause of enmitie."

The fight with Sansjoy is far fiercer than with Sansfoy, and an extended comparison proves most interesting; but mark particularly the different result. The Defender of Faith at once met and overcame a bold Sansfoy, but Sansjoy finally eludes him through Duessa's intervention; that is, in the House of Pride self-deceit still disguises the real cause of his despondency.

The only escape from Pride is through Prudence and Humility, which the Dwarf represents. So we find it is the Dwarf who points out to the Knight the real nature of the place where they are. But though the Knight hurries from the scene of his last adventure, he does not seek to escape the false Fidessa, whom he has championed.

"What man so wise, what earthly wit so ware,
As to discry the crafty cunning traine,
By which deceipt doth maske in visour faire,
And cast her colours dyed deep in graine,
To seeme like truth, whose shape she well can faine,
And fitting gestures to her purpose frame;
The guiltlesse man with guyle to entertaine?
Great maistresse of her art was that false dame,
The false Duessa, cloked with Fidessaes name."

She follows, seeks and finds the Red Cross Knight, no longer militant, reclining by the waters of idleness, "Disarmed all of yroncoted plate," and even that shield of faith thrown aside with its sacred symbol "for soveraine hope." Duessa has led him to the snares of pride once before, and she betrays him again.

Digitized by Google

> "Ere he could his armour on him dight,
> Or get his shield, his monstrous enimy
> With sturdie steps came stalking in his sight,
> An hideous geant, horrible and hye."

And the Red Cross Knight,

> "Disarmed, disgrast, and inwardly dismayde
> And eke so faint in every joynt and vaine,
> Through that fraile fountaine, which him feeble made,"

falls an easy victim to the monster Orgoglio. In allegory Orgoglio signifies braggart, carnal, or physical pride, and it is when the Knight is least active that he becomes his victim.

So, says Ruskin, "after Peter's boast, came Peter's sleeping, from weakness of the flesh, and then, last of all, Peter's fall." Orgoglio throws him into his deepest dungeon, and takes Duessa as his leman dear. And now for ninety days he groans in the dungeons of Orgoglio, before Prince Arthur and his faithful Una release him. In the bitterness of his despair all faith seems dead, and at the moment of rescue he cries to his deliverer:

> "O, who is that, which brings me happy choyce
> Of death, that here lye dying every stound,
> Yet live perforce in balefull darknesse bound?
> For now three moones have changed thrice their hew,
> And have been thrice hid underneath the ground,
> Since I the heavens chearfull face did vew:
> O welcome thou, that doest of death bring tydings trew."

Perhaps this episode in Spenser contains no directly obvious hints, as in every other case in the history of the Knight, that this adventure also is a trial of faith. No such hint is needed at such an advanced point in the story, and the meaning of the whole ought to be clear. His ninety days in the dungeon were not wasted; there was one long struggle between true and false faith in his thoughts continually. Let me quote here from a most appreciative, but, unfortunately, anonymous series of criticisms on the first book of the Faery

Digitized by Google

Queene, which were published in *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1835. "How could the Red Cross Knight have doubt of Una's innocence — after he had seen Duessa turning against him — and the whore of Orgoglio? Had she not left him to rot in a dungeon? And was it possible that he could have lain there three months in its hungry stench without his reason and his conscience telling him that he had been all along in the clutches of a fiend, and had forsaken an angel? His many miseries had indeed been all thrown away upon him, had he not groaned unceasingly in his imprisonment to think that his own fleshly frailties had not only laid himself low, but left that heavenly being without one to care for her in the haunted wilderness."

If anything more is needed to convince him of the nature of the true faith which he had deserted, and the false faith which had deserted him, it is given in that necessary but most loathsome passage in Spenser, the transformation of the seemingly fair Fidessa to the filthy hag Duessa, at Una's command. The Christian Knight — for spite of all weakness and error, he is still the Christian Knight — has no apology to make for past conduct, and so preserves a long silence from the very moment of his deliverance. All the more noteworthy, then, are the first words which Spenser allows us to hear from him only after a long interval. At Prince Arthur's praise of his lady love, the Faery Queene to whom he has been so faithful, the Knight's love for Una can be silent no longer.

> "Thine, O then, said the gentle Redcrosse Knight,
> Next to that ladies love, shall be the place,
> O fairest virgin, full of heavenly light,
> Whose wondrous faith exceeding earthly race,
> Was firmest fixt in my extremest case."

But the Red Cross Knight is never a man of speech. It is important to notice, says Lowell, how very few are the words put in his mouth. "He never meant with words but swords to plead his right." And there still remains a subtle trial of faith where the weapons shall be those least familiar to him. To this the remainder of the famous ninth canto is devoted.

Digitized by Google

In the Cave of Despair, his shield does not ward off the poisoned points of such words as these:

"Why then dost thou, O man of sin, desire
To draw thy dayes forth to their last degree?
Is not the measure of thy sinfull hire
High heaped up with huge iniquitie,
Against the day of wrath, to burden thee?
Is not enough that to this lady mild
Thou falsed hast thy faith with perjurie,
And sold thy selfe to serve Duessa vild,
With whom in all abuse thou hast thy self defild?"

To all the arguments of Despair he replies with complete and forcible refutations, yet so is he "charmed with inchaunted rimes," so is his faith deluded by sophistries that the man of deeds cannot recognize his victory in words.

"In which amazement when the miscreant
Perceived him to waver weake and fraile,
Whiles trembling horror did his conscience dant,
And hellish anguish did his soule assaile;

* * * * * * *

He to him raught a dagger sharpe and keene,
And gave it him in hand: his hand did quake,
And tremble like a leafe of aspin greene,
And troubled bloud through his pale face was seene
To come and goe with tidings from the heart,
As it a running messenger had beene.
At last resolv'd to work his finall smart,
He lifted up his hand, that back againe did start.

"Which when as Una saw, through every vaine
The crudled cold ran to her well of life,
As in a swoone: but soone reliv'd againe,
Out of his hand she snacht the cursed knife
And threw it to the ground, enraged rife,
And to him said; Fie, fie, faint hearted knight,
What meanest thou by this reprochfull strife?
Is this the battaile which thou vaunst to fight
With that fire mouthed dragon, horrible and bright?

Digitized by Google

"Come; come away, fraile, feeble, fleshly wight,
Ne let vaine words bewitch thy manly hart,
Ne divelish thoughts dismay thy constant spright.
In heavenly mercies hast thou not a part?
Why shouldst thou then despeire, that chosen art?
Where justice growes, there grows eke greater grace,
The which doth quench the brond of hellish smart,
And that accurst hand-writing doth deface.
Arise, sir knight, arise, and leave this cursed place."

To fully appreciate the relation of this canto to the allegory one should read the whole of it. The despondency which, as Sansjoy, attacked him in the House of Pride has deepened to despair, and his failing faith is only saved by the reassurances of Una.

But the power which saves him should proceed from within; the Knight must possess it even as Una does, before he can become the perfect knight able to cope with the great Dragon, and worthy to be the husband of the heavenly Una. To attain this higher development he follows the guidance of Una. From the Inferno of Orgoglio's Castle and the Purgatory of the Cave of Despair, we pass to the Paradise of the House of Holiness in the tenth canto. Here are passages of great significance in the interpretation of the allegory.

"By that which lately hapned, Una saw
That this her knight was feeble, and too faint;
And all his sinews woxen weake and raw,
Through long enprisonment, and hard constraint,
Which he endured in his late restraint,
That yet he was unfit for bloudy fight;
Therefore to cherish him with diets daint,
She cast to bring him where he chearen might,
Till he recovered had his late decayed plight."

They go to the House of Holiness, presided over by Dame Celia and her three daughters, Fidelia, Speranza, and Charissa. We must notice that here it is his faith which is first attended to.

Digitized by Google

Entered in, this most beautiful sight greets them:

"Thus as they gan of sundry things devise,
Loe two most goodly virgins came in place,
Alinked arme in arme in lovely wise,
With countenance demure, and modest grace,
They numbered even steps and equall pace:
Of which the eldest, that Fidelia hight,
Like sunny beames threw from her christall face
That could have dazd the rash beholders sight,
And round about her head did shine like heavens light.

"She was araied all in lilly white,
And in her right hand bore a cup of gold,
With wine and water fild up to the hight,
In which a serpent did himselfe enfold,
That horrour made to all that did behold;
But she no whit did chaunge her constant mood:
And in her other hand she fast did hold
A booke, that was both signd and seald with blood:
Wherein darke things were writ, hard to be understood.

* * * * * * * *

"Now when their wearie limbes with kindly rest,
And bodies were refresht with due repast,
Faire Una gan Fidelia faire request,
To have her knight into her schoolehouse plaste,
That of her heavenly learning he might taste,
And heare the wisedom of her words divine.
She graunted, and that knight so much agraste,
That she him taught celestial discipline,
And opened his dull eyes, that light mote in them shine.

"And that her sacred booke, with blood ywrit,
That none could read, except she did them teach,
She unto him disclosed every whit;
And heavenly documents thereout did preach,
That weaker wit of man could never reach;
Of God; of grace; of justice; of free will;
That wonder was to heare her goodly speach:
For she was able with her words to kill,
And raise againe to life the hart that she did thrill.

Digitized by Google

"And when she list poure out her larger spright,
She would command the hasty Sunne to stay,
Or backward turne his course from heavens hight:
Sometimes great hostes of men she could dismay;
Dry-shod to passe she parts the flouds in tway;
And eke huge mountains from their native seat
She would command themselves to beare away,
And throw in raging sea with roaring threat.
Almightie God her gave such powre and puissaunce great.

"The faithfull knight now grew in little space,
By hearing her, and by her sisters lore,
To such perfection of all heavenly grace,"

that Fidelia could do little more for him, and Una could at last call him "her faithfull knight." Now we see one leading reason why so much is made of the need of strong faith and of the help of Fidelia. To no other personage in his entire poem has Spenser assigned such tremendous power, and no other can confer such power, and only by aid of such strength can the great Dragon be overcome. There is no fear hereafter that the intelligence of the champion shall be blinded to the discernment of the true and the false faith. So purified are those eyes which once saw Fidessa in Duessa, that those visions open to the eye of faith alone are revealed on the Mount of Contemplation. A holy father shows to him the joys which can be his only

"when thou famous victory hast won
And high emongst all knights hast hong thy shield, —"

that shield of faith which is to be to all knights an everlasting remembrance that faith without works is dead, but that by faith the true knight can overcome all enemies. Here occurs a most noteworthy passage. It is not until we approach the end of the allegory that we can see the beginning of it. "'Tis worth while," says Upton again, "to see with what great art our poet by degrees unravels his story: the poem opens with the Christian Knight; you see his character yet know not his name or lineage; some few hints are afterwards flung out; but in this canto you are fully sat-

Digitized by Google

isfied. (Spenser is very fond of this kind of suspense.)" Indeed to the Red Cross Knight himself his name and lineage are unknown, until here revealed by the holy father.

> "Thou faire ymp, sprong out from English race,
> However now accompted elfins sonne,
> * * * * * * * *
> There is ordained for thee a blessed end:
> For thou emongst those saints, whom thou dost see,
> Shall be a saint, and thine owne nations frend
> And patrone: thou Saint George shalt called bee,
> Saint George of mery England, the signe of victoree."

Before this, we have only in vague, conjectural way understood that the Red Cross Knight represented reformed England, but as "Saint George of mery England," the nationality of the hero is put forward as the great key to the solution of the historical part of the allegory. Saint George is England, or the line of sovereigns who represent England, and we recall that just at the beginning of the Reformation, upon this line of sovereigns had been conferred the title of Defender of the Faith; but we shall come back to this.

In the progress of the poem we have finally come to the great scene of the Triumph of Faith, that combat which is the mission of the hero from the beginning, whereby the parents of Una are to be delivered from the great dragon. Abundant fault has been found with this eleventh canto, because of the inequality of the three days' combat between the Knight and the flying dragon "like a great hill" with a swingeing tail, "that of three furlongs did but little lack." It is an unequal combat, and only a Knight endued with the power which Fidelia confers could endure it. But even then there is a time near the end of the fight when his faith seems wellnigh lost, when with that swingeing tail, "that high trees overthrew and rocks in pieces tore," the dragon,

> "With sharpe intended sting so rude him smot,
> That to the earth him drove, as stricken dead;
> Ne living wight would have him life behot:
> The mortall sting his angry needle shot

Digitized by Google

Quite through his shield, and in his shoulder seasd,
Where fast it stucke, ne would there out be got:
The griefs thereof him wondrous sore diseasd,
Ne might his rankling paine with patience be appeasd.

"But yet more mindfull of his honour deare
Then of the grievous smart, which did him wring,
From loathed soile he can him lightly reare,
And strove to loose the far infixed sting:
Which when in vaine he tryde with struggeling
Inflam'd with wrath, his raging blade he heft,
And strooke so strongly, that the knotty string
Of his huge taile he quite a sunder cleft;
Five joints thereof he hewd, and but the stump him left.

"Hart cannot think what outrage, and what cries
With foule enfouldred smoake and flashing fire,
The hell-bred beast threw forth unto the skies,
That all was covered with darkenesse dire:
Then fraught with rancour, and engorged ire,
He cast at once him to avenge for all,
And gathering up himselfe out of the mire
With his uneven wings, did fiercely fall
Upon his sunne-bright shield, and gript it fast withall.

"Much was the man encombred with his hold,
In feare to lose his weapon in his paw,
Ne wist yet, how his talants to unfold;
For harder was from Cerberus greedy jaw
To plucke a bone, then from his cruell claw
To reave by strength the griped gage away:
Thrise he assayed it from his foot to draw,
And thrise in vaine to draw it did assay,
It booted nought to thinke to robbe him of his pray.

"Tho when he saw no power might prevaile,
His trusty sword he cald to his last aid,
Wherewith he fiercely did his foe assaile,
And double blows about him stoutly laid,
That glauncing fire out of the yron plaid;

Digitized by Google

As sparckles from the andvile used to fly,
When heavy hammers on the wedge are swaid;
There with at last he forst him to unty
One of his grasping feete, him to defend thereby.

"The other foot, fast fixed on his shield,
Whenas no strength nor stroks mote him constraine
To loose, ne yet the warlike pledge to yield,
He smot thereat with all his might and maine,
That nought so wondrous puissance might sustaine;
Upon the joint the lucky steele did light,
And made such way, that hewd it quite in twaine;
The paw yett missed not his minisht might
But hong still on the shield, as it at first was pight."

He has defended the faith, and this time without another's aid; one more struggle and the combat is ended. For the second time he is called the faithful Knight, but the Triumph of Faith is not yet complete. Before going further let us review certain points in the story.

In following out the allegory thus, one cannot feel that in a poem so saturated with allegories this one is only accidental. On the abstract side there is a lofty moral allegory, obvious enough without comment. But on the other side there is a historical or personal allegory which I believe to be the one "continued allegory."

Henry VIII. came to the throne of England in 1509. Luther nailed his ninety-five theses to the door of the Wittenberg Castle Church on All Saints' eve, 1517. Before the death of his elder brother, Henry VIII. had been educated for the Church. Deeply interested in the Renaissance he was still more interested in the Reformation. In the eleventh year of Henry's reign, in October, 1520, Luther published the most important work of the times, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church of God." To this the royal theologian of England made reply with a book called "*Assertio septem sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum.*" Regarding this book a recent Roman Catholic authority has written: "We know of none among the contemporary works which defend

Digitized by Google

the Church more filially and more warmly." For this enthusiastic defence, in the following year, 1521, Pope Leo X. conferred upon Henry the title "*Fidei Defensor*," and commanded all Christians so to address him. The title has been held by the sovereigns of England to this day. Pope Clement VII. confirmed the title. In 1527, Protestants were still persecuted in England, but Henry had resolved on the divorce, which led to such important results. In 1531 the king was acknowledged supreme head of the Church of England. In 1532 Anne Boleyn was crowned. In 1534 the Act of Supremacy was passed. From that time on, the former defender of the Roman faith became its oppressor and the champion and defender of the Protestant faith. Henceforward, except in the reign of Mary, whenever an English sovereign used the title "*Fidei Defensor*," the implied adjective was wholly different in significance from the one in the minds of Popes Leo X. and Clement VII.

Now let us see what use Spenser made of this material. St. George is *Fidei Defensor* not representing Henry VIII. alone, but rather the sovereigns of England, who bear the title of Defender of the Faith. With the just license of a patriotic poet, Spenser represents Una, or the cause of truth, as the peculiar charge of St. George, or England. At the beginning of the allegory the tempest of the Reformation drives the wandering pair into a labyrinth of Error, and there St. George fights sturdily against the Dragon Error in defence of Truth and Faith. Perhaps never in all Christian history has error been so common, so excusable. In spite of his theological training, or possibly because of it, to Henry VIII., as to nearly all Englishmen, the true faith seemed at first to be that which every Christian sought in the Church of Rome. Even Luther was a devoted Papist before he became a devoted Reformer.

Throughout the first of the allegory Una is veiled to her lover, and we see the significance of that puzzling mystery. The Dragon of the Wood of Error was a veritable dragon, and in attacking it, St. George was the champion of no false faith, but simply struggling with misunderstanding. Una

Digitized by Google

typifies the true Christian church on earth, long represented by Rome only, from this time forward represented, though still half concealed under her black stole, by the Protestant Church only. She is that heavenly truth which Luther sought first in Rome, which England at the beginning of the Reformation still seemed to see in Rome, and St. George is her champion. Archimago, symbol of papal influence, by lies and delusions, convinces St. George that his veiled Una is not truth, but foulest falsehood. The meaning is, that before England found its way out of the great tangle of error, it was led to turn from the true faith as St. George abandoned Una.

We next find the King of England defending the false faith, as St. George becomes the defender of Fidessa not knowing that she is the falsely faithless Duessa. But in this very change St. George gives the death blow to Sansfoy, the faithless, and becomes Fidessa's sole defender. In much the same way England sought to defend the island faith from injury by making Henry supreme head of the church in England, and thus gave a far heavier blow than was intended to the old established papal faith on the island. I think, too, that in the relations of Duessa and the Red Cross Knight there is much more than a shadowy fabric of allusion to Henry VIII.'s favor shown to certain less substantial phases of the Renaissance, which might well be represented by the oriental Duessa, the daughter of the emperor of the West, and the link between Constantinople and Rome. In the second volume of the "Stones of Venice," Ruskin forcibly shows how the spirit of the Renaissance proved injurious to both Protestant and Catholic. The succeeding career of the Red Cross Knight, his half-hearted, half-successful combat at the House of Pride, his disarming at the fountain of Sloth, and his long captivity in the dungeon of Orgoglio, shadow forth certain features of the history of England, near the middle of the sixteenth century. Orgoglio's "throwing the Red Cross Knight into a dungeon," writes Ruskin, "is a type of the captivity of true religion under the temporal power of corrupt churches, more especially of the Church of

Digitized by Google

Rome; and of its gradual wasting away in unknown places, while carnal pride has the pre-eminence over all things. . . . Prince Arthur, in whom, as Spenser himself tells us, is set forth generally magnificence, but who, as is shown by the choice of the hero's name, is more especially the magnificence, or literally, 'great doing,' of the Kingdom of England going forth with Truth attacks Orgoglio, or the Pride of Papacy, slays him; strips Duessa, or Falsehood, naked, and liberates the Red Cross Knight." The title *Fidei Defensor* conferred upon Henry VIII. was in one sense but an ornament of worldly pride. The assumption of the title of the Head of the Church was blasphemy and arrogance on the part of Henry VIII. Remember that Fidessa leads St. George to the House of Worldly Pride, and Henry's carnal pride, or pride of power which the giant Orgoglio typifies, may have seemed to Spenser the chief fault of his later years. At this point the more personal part of the allegory as pertaining to Henry VIII. comes to an end. If the poet's picture of the king seems too highly colored, remember that history has taught us to understand his character more clearly than was possible with Spenser. What Spenser saw was the coming of the gospel light apparently through his wisdom, not remarking that

> "Love could teach a monarch to be wise,
> And gospel light first dawned from Boleyn's eyes;"

but Spenser's vision was obscured by many circumstances. Moreover, in a poem whose avowed object was the flattery of his daughter, we should not look for spots on the character of so great a king.

Before the adventure of St. George at the Cave of Despair, there is a bright passage like the hopeful reign of Edward before the dismal rule of Mary. But to all Protestants in England there came a period of despair in the reign of Bloody Mary, more intense than that typified in the famous ninth canto. Again the comforting joy and peace which glorifies the following canto in the story of the House of Holiness, may equally well express the feelings of the adherents of the true faith, at

Digitized by Google

typif [illegible]ssion of Elizabeth. The beginning of her reign was
by l [illegible] a new beginning for the Protestant faith in England.
still [illegible] George, worn with mistakes and struggles, was trained
Chu[illegible] perfection of true faith and good offices in the calm of
soug[illegible] home, so young England, after its stormy trials of
Ref[illegible] and persecution, rested in the quiet of Elizabeth's
her [illegible] and grew in the knowledge of the true faith. It
lies [illegible] until after the discipline of St. George, this real
is n[illegible] mation and enlightenment of faith, that he could cope
befo[illegible] the great dragon. The destruction of this monster of
it w[illegible] Una's parents from "eternal bondage." Precisely
don[illegible] this may signify is not wholly obvious. The writer in
W[illegible]'s, before quoted, suggests that the parents of truth
faith [illegible] be no other than the sacred Scriptures, the Old and New
kno[illegible] so long imprisoned in the brazen walls of igno-
very[illegible] and superstition, but wholly freed by the triumph of
faith[illegible] Perhaps the deliverance of England from
sam[illegible] by wars on the Continents and by the defeat of
inju[illegible] may be nearer to the historical meaning. In
land [illegible] with the betrothal of St. George and Una,
the [illegible] final and indissoluble union of England with the
that [illegible] faith of the Reformed Church.
ther[illegible] until this betrothal, that the veiled beauty of
VII [illegible] is revealed to her lover.

the [illegible] bright as doth the morning starre appeare
oric [illegible] of the East with flaming lockes bedight,
and [illegible] well that dawning day is drawing neare,
sec[illegible] to the world does bring long wished light:
sho[illegible] sure and fresh that lady shewd herselfe in sight:
bot
Re[illegible] sure and fresh, as freshest flowre in May;
at t[illegible] she has layd her mournefull stole aside,
an[illegible] widow-like sad wimple throwne away,
for[illegible] rewith her heavenly beautie she did hide,
mi[illegible] on her weary journey she did ride;
Re[illegible] on her now a garment she did weare
ty[illegible] white, withoutten spot or pride,
po[illegible] eemed like silke and silver woven neare,
[illegible] ither silke nor silver therein did appeare.

Digitized by Google

"The blazing brightnesse of her [illegible]
And glorious light of her [illegible]
To tell were as to strive against the [illegible]
My raged rimes are all too [illegible]
Her heavenly lineaments [illegible]
Ne wonder; for her own [illegible]
All were she dayly with himselfe [illegible]
Did wonder much at her celestial [illegible]
Oft had he seen her faire but never [illegible]

"So fairely dight, when she in presence [illegible]
She to her sire made humble reverence,
And bowed low, that her right well became,
And added grace unto her excellence:
Who with great wisedome and grave eloquence
Thus gan to say. But ere he thus had said,
With flying speede and seeming great pretense,
Came running in, much like a man dismaid
A messenger with letters, which his message said.

"All in the open hall amazed stood
At suddeinnesse of that unwary sight,
And wondred at his breathlesse hasty mood:
But he for naught would stay his passage right,
Till fast before the king he did alight;
Where falling flat, great humblesse he did make
And kist the ground, whereon his foot was pight:
Then to his hands that writ he did betake,
Which he disclosing, read thus, as the paper spake;

"To thee, most mighty King of Eden faire,
Her greeting sends in these sad lines addrest
The wofull daughter, and forsaken heire
Of that great Emperour of all the West;
And bids thee be advised for the best,
Ere thou thy daughter linck in holy band
Of wedlocke to that new unknown guest:
For he already plighted his right hand
Unto another love, and to another land.

Digitized by Google

the accession of Elizabeth. The beginning of her reign was really a new beginning for the Protestant faith in England. As St. George, worn with mistakes and struggles, was trained to the perfection of true faith and good offices in the calm of Celia's home, so young England, after its stormy trials of doubt and persecution, rested in the quiet of Elizabeth's kingdom and grew in the knowledge of the true faith. It was not until after the discipline of St. George, this real Re-formation and enlightenment of faith, that he could cope with the great dragon. The destruction of this monster of sin frees Una's parents from "eternal bondage." Precisely what this may signify is not wholly obvious. The writer in *Blackwood's*, before quoted, suggests that the parents of truth can be no other than the sacred Scriptures, the Old and New Testament, so long imprisoned in the brazen walls of ignorance and superstition, but wholly freed by the triumph of Reformation. Perhaps the deliverance of England from papal power by wars on the Continents and by the defeat of the Armada, may be nearer to the historical meaning. In the final canto, with the betrothal of St. George and Una, we have the final and indissoluble union of England with the true Christian faith of the Reformed Church.

It is not until this betrothal, that the veiled beauty of Una's face is revealed to her lover.

"As bright as doth the morning starre appeare
Out of the East with flaming lockes bedight,
To tell that dawning day is drawing neare,
And to the world does bring long wished light:
So faire and fresh that lady shewd herselfe in sight:

"So faire and fresh, as freshest flowre in May;
For she has layd her mournefull stole aside,
And widow-like sad wimple throwne away,
Wherewith her heavenly beautie she did hide,
While on her weary journey she did ride;
And on her now a garment she did weare
All lily white, withoutten spot or pride,
That seemed like silke and silver woven neare,
But neither silke nor silver therein did appeare.

Digitized by Google

"The blazing brightnesse of her beauties beame,
And glorious light of her sunshyny face,
To tell were as to strive against the streame:
My raged rimes are all too rude and bace
Her heavenly lineaments for to enchace.
Ne wonder; for her own deare loved knight,
All were she dayly with himselfe in place,
Did wonder much at her celestiall sight
Oft had he seen her faire but never so faire dight,

"So fairely dight, when she in presence came,
She to her sire made humble reverence,
And bowed low, that her right well became,
And added grace unto her excellence:
Who with great wisedome and grave eloquence
Thus gan to say. But ere he thus had said,
With flying speede and seeming great pretense,
Came running in, much like a man dismaid
A messenger with letters, which his message said.

"All in the open hall amazed stood
At suddeinnesse of that unwary sight,
And wondred at his breathlesse hasty mood:
But he for naught would stay his passage right,
Till fast before the king he did alight;
Where falling flat, great humblesse he did make
And kist the ground, whereon his foot was pight:
Then to his hands that writ he did betake,
Which he disclosing, read thus, as the paper spake;

"To thee, most mighty King of Eden faire,
Her greeting sends in these sad lines addrest
The wofull daughter, and forsaken heire
Of that great Emperour of all the West;
And bids thee be advised for the best,
Ere thou thy daughter linck in holy band
Of wedlocke to that new unknowen guest:
For he already plighted his right hand
Unto another love, and to another land.

Digitized by Google

"To me sad mayd, or rather widow sad,
He was affiaunced long time before,
And sacred pledges he both gave and had,
False erraunt knight, infamous and forswore;
Witnesse the burning altars which he swore,
And guilty heavens of his bold perjury,
Which though he hath polluted oft of yore,
Yet I to them for judgment just do fly,
And them conjure t' avenge this shamefull injury.

"Therefore since mine he is, or free or bond,
Or false or trew, or living or else dead,
Withhold, O sovereign prince your hasty hond
From knitting league with him, I you aread;
Ne weene my right with strength adowne to tread,
Through weaknesse of my widowhed, or woe;
For truth is strong her rightfull cause to plead,
And shall finde friends, if need requireth soe.
So bids thee well to fare, thy neither friend nor foe.

FIDESSA."

The messenger is Archimago, who always in Spenser is the agent of papal intrigue, and the letter, with all the boldness of a bull from the Vatican, represents the last overtures of Rome seeking to win England back to the old false faith.

This remarkable allegory of the Defender of the Faith runs without a single break through every incident of the legend of the Red Cross Knight. It excludes not one of the accepted interpretations of allegory in any part of the book, for it is Spenser's custom to give a number of significations to the same incidents and characters. In history we can still catch glimpses of the interest if not enthusiasm with which the great addition to the royal title was generally received. England has had something like it in recent days; but if the virtual self-assumption of the title of Empress of India gave matter for congratulation, how much deeper the significance of the title, Defender of the Faith, conferred by what England then believed to be the infallible authority of heaven. England's right to this title after her complete change of face is to this

Digitized by Google

day hotly discussed and denied by Roman Catholics, and history gives us some understanding of contemporary opinion on the question. It would be strange indeed if so enthusiastic a Protestant as Spenser took no notice of it. Plainly he has given it unusual attention, and in philosophical allegory he has given its true interpretation, showing that the virgin queen could wear with increased confidence a divinely given title. He intimates that, independent of papal decree, the title belongs in a peculiar sense to the sovereigns of England from the earliest times, and later researches have established the antiquity of the title. And to the Queen as "Defender of the Faith" he dedicates his poem.

Digitized by Google

V. — *Standard English: its Pronunciation, How Lerned.*

By F. A. MARCH,

PROFESSOR IN LAFAYETTE COLLEGE.

THE most activ students of the English language ar fonetists, students of vocal sounds and fonetic laws. The elementary facts on which fonetic science is based, ar the pronunciation of individuals, and the movements of the vocal organs by which the pronunciation is effected. These ar very difficult to ascertain with precision, and of course each person can most conveniently study his own articulation. Professor Whitney was, I believ, the first to attempt a scientific description of his own nativ pronunciation, as distinguisht from his cultured habits. In 1875, in the second series of his Oriental and Linguistic Studies, appeard a paper entitld "The Elements of English Pronunciation," which sets forth an analysis and description of the elements of his nativ pronunciation.

This has been followd by similar papers from Mr. Sweet, the hed of the London fonetists, and others. They hav stil further elaborated the description of their speeches and attempted to giv a sort of fonagram of their colloquial frases and connected discourse. This work has excited great interest among filologists and teachers of modern languages. In 1885 Mr. Sweet publisht in German a Primer of Spoken English, in which all the English is givn in fonetic writing as this colloquial Londonese.

Prof. Whitney spoke of his paper as a contribution to English dialectic utterance, and again as the "Confessions of a Provincial." But Mr. Sweet and his followers urge their confessions upon the world as the best of English. They urge foren teachers to uze these instruction books, and they urge spelling reformers to adopt their pronunciation and spelling in place of the common orthografy.

Digitized by Google

When the talk is of standard English Mr. Sweet himself merely says that he knows nothing about it. But when great leaders ar agnostics, the followers ar negators.

So Aug. Western, author of a book on English fonetics, says that he "does not agree that the language teacher should endevor to represent that form of speech that wil be most redily understood by all educated nativs, simply because such a form doesn't exist. Any one who speaks a local dialect wil both understand and be understood by all educated nativs better than a forener who has lernd an artificial standard of the language." Ther is no such thing as a standard language, over and abuv the local dialects, with these fonetists.

Their difficulty seems to be sumthing like that of the nominalists about general notions. Ther ar right-angld triangls they say, obtuse-angld triangls and acute-angld triangls. These uze up the hole set and leav nothing for a triangl in general. So every man is either a Londoner, or a Scot, or an American, or something, and each speaks his own dialect, and ther is nobody left to speak standard English.

The scientific fonetist is at loss to know to whom he ought to apply his apparatus of fonometers to giv him standard English. And anything which can not be mesurd with a fonometer is nonexistent to hiz science. Thackeray said that he uzed no part of his hed abuv his eyes in his literary work. So these fonetists uze no part of their heds abuv the ears.

But a standard language implies sumthing more than observation. It is an ideal to be attaind by the reason. It implies history, and the winning of authority. It implies induction.

How, then, does a standard language come into being?

Persons, or tribes in the state of nature, take their language by tradition from those about them. They catch up from their parents and their playmates the words and frases which they hear oftenest, and acquire a natural speech without any special exercise of reason or reflectiv purpose. Such speech is the result of social necessities acting under the common laws of association. Every tribe, every family, every person, has natural peculiarities: dialects, idioms, idiotisms, ar free, and in a certain sense ther ar as many dialects as ther ar

Digitized by Google

persons. Of language in this state it is wel enuf said, that it grows; it is not made, but grows. Each person talks for himself and knows no better speech than his own.

A standard speech may appear thru the influence of government or of literature. When tribes ar organized into a nation proper, sum tribe becums the ruling one. Then the laws, the public documents, the formulas of the courts and of important business, the charters, the conveyances of land ar prevailingly promulgated and writn in this dialect of the ruling tribe, and all other tribes ar compeld to uze this dialect more or less, and to recognize it as in sum sense a higher and more important form of speech than their own. It finally becums the common speech of courtiers and officials everywhere, a standard speech.

But another way, and a more important way in which standard speech becomes establisht is thru the influence of literature; under the influence of reason, and the intuitions of beauty and order. Whenever deeds ar done or to be done which exalt the faculties of large numbers of men, the creativ power works in language under the guidance of beauty. The poet, the orator rouses to heroic acts or recounts inspiriting achievments in wurthy forms of speech. The happiest forms of the popular dialect which had grown up by association ar selected and combined into speech more perspicuous, more vigorous, more regular, and more harmonious than had been known before. Successful compositions of this kind ar preservd and make part of the education of the nobl and cultured. They ar imitated and accumulate from generation to generation, til the time cums for Homeric poems and classic Greek, or for Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Bacon.

It has been sumtimes said that sum book is the hart or soul of every proper language, that Homer was the hart of the Greek language, the Bible of Luther the hart of modern German, the English Bible the hart of English.

It is certain that no great language has been left to the laws of association and grown to its forms of power and beuty unaided by reason. The steps and stages of progress in literary languages ar mostly recorded in books. The part

Digitized by Google

of a language which is standard in the eminent sense is at first small; the happy idioms of the Bible, the ballads, Chaucer. Then for generations there is slow increase, one new idiom from this author, two or three from that, til Shakespeare gathers them up by the hundred and adds his hundreds more. How many generations has it taken to incorporate the frases of Milton into the speech, so that one uzes them without quotation or allusion, and his "Babylonish dialect" is standard English?

Close upon the creativ contributors to the language in literature proper cum students of language and literature, who make dictionaries and grammars for the standard speech based upon inductions from the literature. Such students do not restrict themselves to books, but gather new data from observation of living speech, of great orators, actors, gentlemen. Then cums critical study of the laws or rules working in these facts of language, with a view to teach them to new generations and to improve the speech.

Work of this sort is at first of narrow range, and small bulk, and hasty induction. Personal authority is more lively in it than reason. Mere grammarians or dictionary-makers ar of slight esteem. But great authors, Dryden, Pope, Addison, Swift, enounce maxims of style and definitions of words, and pronounce sentences of outlawry on certain words and frases, and of pardon or approval on others. By and by a French Academy or Dr. Johnson is able to produce a great dictionary, including standard words enough to constitute a language, a work supported at every word by an authoritativ body of authors and enforced by the power and personal authority of a dictator in the relm of letters. Such a book is a record of standard English. It is not perfect, of course, not infallibl. From its decisions an appeal always lies to the classic English authors and to reason. In the English language ther hav been a succession of dictionaries and grammars making continual, tho slow, advance in recording the standard speech. These books also ar authorities, and help to shape the speech. They ar like the decisions of the judges in common law. In deciding what

Digitized by Google

law is, they make law for the future. So the students of language teaching laws of language make them effectiv in the language of the next generation. Ther is standard speech, as ther is common law.

This standard English is an ideal, somewhat different from colloquial speech, not spoken in perfection by any one, not even perfectly recorded or described in any book. It has its history. It is still making history. Its definitions and idioms hav been more studied than its pronunciation and spelling, but these too hav their standard forms. At the meeting of this Association at Hanover in 1884 I presented a paper on the influence of writn English and of the linguistic authorities upon spoken English. It was an examination of the pronunciation in Walker's dictionary and showd that a very large number of changes in pronunciation has taken place since that book was writn, and that they hav most of them been in accordance with the recommendations of the dictionary, and many of them contrary to the law of least effort.

The following classes of sounds wer mentiond as having changed in England, and more in America.

1. *a* preceded by guttural *g* or *c* softend by the intervention of *e*. "When the *a* is pronounced short as in the first syllables of *candle*, *gander*, &c., the interposition of the *e* is very perceptible and indeed unavoidable: for though we can pronounce *guard* and *cart* without interposing the *e*, it is impossible to pronounce *garrison* and *carriage* in the same manner."

2. *e* before *r* pronounced *a* in *clerk*, *sergeant*, *servant*, *merchant*, &c.

3. *e* pronounced *i* in *yes*, *pretty*, *engine*, &c.

4. *i* pronounced *ĭ*, in an initial syllabl unaccented before a syllabl beginning with a consonant: *didactic*, *digamma*, *dilate*, *fidelity*, &c.

5. Words ending in silent *e* after a short vowel: *crocodile*, *columbine*, *eglantine*, *metalline*, &c.

6. The unaccented vowels pronounced in England with the obscure sound ar now in large numbers distinguisht in America.

7. *s* pronounced as *z* between two sonants by Walker often has its name sound: *disable*, *disdain*, *absolve*, *resignation*, *nasal*, &c.

8. *d* + *i* and *d* + *y* sounded *j* by Walker, and *t* + *i*, *t* + *y* sounded *ch*, ar now often *dy* and *ty*: *soldier*, *educate*, *nature*, &c.

Digitized by Google

A large number of anomalous words which Walker notes as having a deplorabl pronunciation hav becum regular: *ac'ceptable, ălienate, annihilate, apostle, apothecary, apron, asparagus, authority, been, bellows, chorister, confessor, construe, cucumber, catch, caviare, chap, chart, china, dictionary, oatmeal, ostrich, schedule,* &c., &c.

A comparison of later pronouncing dictionaries shows that ther is a constant and rapid change in the direction of what ar recognized by the authorities as analogies of the language, and of etymological truth. In Walker's day, *catch* was almost universally pronounced *cŏtch* in the capital; *chap* was calld *chŏp*, and described as "one of those incorrigibl words the pronunciation and orthografy of which must ever be at variance"; *chart* was "almost or quite universally pronounced" *cart; china* was *chāne; cucumber* was "too firmly fixt in its sound of *cowcumber* to be alterd," and "must be clast with its irregular fellow esculent *asparagus*," (*sparrow grass*); *dictionary* was "a few years ago universally pronounced *dixnary*, and a person would have been thought a pedant who pronounced it as spelt, but now *dixnary* is rather vulgar." Hundreds of such pronunciations hav givn place to regular and distinct articulation of the writn words. The law of least effort has yielded to the teaching of the schoolroom. Physiological laws exert less effect than ideals, than reason. Tradition yields to culture.

Our pronouncing dictionaries hav heretofore givn the full, distinct sounds of English words as utterd by traind orators speaking them with emfasis. In American schools these sounds ar carefully taught, and constitute the primary concept of the word.

Teaching pronunciation has two parts, first: giving a clear and distinct concept of the sound to be utterd; second, training the vocal organs to make the sound correctly upon a volition to utter the concept. We do not in speaking wil to move each separate muscl, we only wil to make the sound, to utter the concept.

And teaching conversation, or any connected discourse, implies more than this. As we talk we wil to sound our

Digitized by Google

concepts. But the law of least effort works, and in conversation especially we do not use energy enuf to put the organs of speech thru the proper movements, or send up volume of voice sufficient to bring out the resonance of the vowel chambers. The same letter in different words, the same word in different relations to accent, emfasis, and feeling, varies freely by shades of sound so delicate that no notation can giv them. The speech is, as J. Grimm says, nicht einmal lehrbaren, nur lernbaren. It cannot be taught, it may be caught.

It has been common to teach foreners the standard pronunciation, and let them catch the conversational weakenings. But the new fonetists propose to teach conversational pronunciation as primary English. The sentence is taken as a unit, and sentences ar caught by imitation of their colloquial utterance in London. It is denied that ther is any such speech as the standard speech of the dictionaries.

In answer to this it has been said that the standard speech is embodied in literature and recorded in dictionaries and grammars. For pronunciation we look to the rhythms and rimes of the poets. These assure us of the number of syllabls in the words they use, of their accent and the resemblances of sound in the accented syllabls. The new fonetists pronounce *difference* difrŭns. But one of the best known stanzas of Wordsworth reads:

> "She lived unknown, and few could know
> When Lucy ceased to be;
> But she is in her grave, and, oh,
> The difference to me."

And Tennyson says in another verse almost as famous:

> "For woman is not undevelopt man,
> But diverse: could we make her as the man,
> Sweet love were slain; his dearest bond is this,
> Not like to like, but like in difference."
>
> *The Princess*, vii., 262.

And again:

> "Or will one beam be less intense
> When thy peculiar difference
> Is cancell'd in the world of sense?"
>
> *The Two Voices*, 41.

Digitized by Google

Ornament is to be taught as *ŏŏnŭmŭnt.* But no great poet has rimed with dropt *rs*, as *born* with *dawn, doors* with *cause*, as Mr. Sweet does, or with *-ment* as *-mŭnt.*

> "She was a phantom of delight
> When first she gleam'd upon my sight;
> A lovely apparition, sent
> To be a moment's ornament."
>
> *Wordsworth.*

> "Each month is various to present
> The world with some development."
>
> *Tennyson. The Two Voices*, 75.

Many facts about pronunciation which cannot be lernd from the poets ar lernd from observation of living orators and actors, and recorded on the ground of wide induction.

A person who has been traind to standard pronunciation is easily distinguisht from an untraind speaker, even in his colloquial utterances.

His variations from the standard sounds ar weakenings; the concept is present, the organs move. An attentiv listener close before him can distinguish each letter. Illiterates leav their organs in the neutral position, and positivly make the neutral vowel of *but* or *burr* for any unaccented vowel, and make no movement to articulate many consonants.

Colloquial pronunciation is not fixt for familiar sentences, much less for literature. Contractions, weakenings, ar used or not according to the feeling of the moment, the ernestness or levity of the speaker, the connection suggesting distinctness or plesant rhythm, the persons addrest, and other causes.

The clear tones, in short, should be dominant, the others tastefully used in particular connections and moods. American habits in this matter differ much from those of London, as shown by the new fonetists. When one of their periodicals prints one of my letters in their spelling, I feel as if they misrepresented my tone and manner as well as pronunciation.

Untraind popular orators from England, whose oratory is only a loud utterance of their colloquial articulation, ar not

Digitized by Google

easily understood by American audiences, but when English scholars do us the honor of addressing the Philological Association, nobody notices their pronunciation as peculiar. A Frenchman or German who was grounded first in the London colloquial, and had no guiding concepts of the standard pronunciation, would be thereby markt in America as a forener, and an illiterate one.

It is very desirabl for the science of language to hav minute and accurate accounts of the conversational speech of Londoners. Such accounts ar also of much use to persons who wish to pass for nativs of the metropolis. Similar accounts of the speech at Oxford and Cambridge, at Edinburgh and Dublin, at New York, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, would hav like value. But in order of teaching these should be secondary to the classic speech.

It is also possibl and desirabl to determin a standard conversational utterance, so far as to record in the dictionaries the common weakenings and the limits of allowabl weakenings in each word as secondary to the ruling concept. Such a record is to be attempted in the Century dictionary. It must be establisht by induction, as an ideal from wide and select observation, shaped under the direction of laws of economy and eufony. It must not accept dialectical peculiarities.

Since the colloquial speeches of different regions of English speaking peopls are different no one of them should be substituted for the standard speech of literature as giving the ruling concepts for pronunciation.

Standard English, the heir of all the ages, resting on a solid foundation of literature and observations, recorded in dictionaries and grammars, is a permanent and authoritativ institution, a stronghold of the unity and power of the Anglo-Saxon race. It has a right of possession not to be devested by singl localities or passing fashions.

Digitized by Google

VI. — *Register of New Words.*

By FISK P. BREWER,

GRINNELL, IOWA.

It is proposed that the Philological Association publish from time to time a register of new words. One advantage of such publication would be to direct seasonable attention to the words, and thus to bring to light the circumstances of their origin. Evidence of when and by whom they wer first uzed might thus be saved from oblivion. The preparing of such an annual list would require the coöperation of numbers, and would accord wel with the purpose of the Association.[1]

"New words" means practically words not yet in any dictionary. Whoever meets a word in his reading not found with the right meaning in any dictionary accessible to him should copy the passage on a postal card, or on paper of that size. The word itself should be writn plainly on the upper left-hand corner, and then the name of the author, the title of the book or jurnal, the date, with the page, and any other fact needed to verify the reference. These citations should be forwarded to a designated officer or committee of the association; such new words as seem worthy of acceptance to be printed with their authorities in the Proceedings.

The plan may be illustrated by the list of words givn below. Some of its words would perhaps be excluded by more careful taste. Where an erlier or better exampl can be reasonably hoped for, the word and authority may be printed without the quotation, as under *boodler.* When exampls of erlier use afterwards come in, the date, and in

[1] In accordance with Professor Brewer's proposition, the Executive Committee invite communications and contributions of the kind described above, as an experiment. All communications relating to the subject should be addressed to the Secretary, who under the direction of a sub-committee will edit the material furnished, and publish it from time to time in the Proceedings. — Secretary.

Digitized by Google

important cases, the citation itself, may be givn, as under *belligerency.* The erliest exampl of *belligerency* which Murray givs is from a Boston newspaper in 1863. Words need not be defined when the meaning is plain in the quotation, but some, like *arbutus* and *bald,* may require a note to explain them. An adjectiv when first uzed as a noun, or a noun uzed as a verb, may be considerd a new word; so also words which hav a new sense should be sent in, and compound words when they need defining, like *biscuit-block* or *body-wood.* Words which hav not been uzed in print should not be enterd in the list. It may be worth noticing that one man speaks of a *clevel* of corn, and another of throwing a *darnic,* and a student of having to *bach* because of the high price of board. But printing is so easy now that it is wel to wait for *bona fide* printed exampls; albeit not every monstrosity christend by printer's ink can be accepted as a living word.

If the registering of words should meet with favor, the cards sent to the Committee might be preservd in a box in alfabetical order, as a card-catalog of new words. Any member could make a catalog of his own by pasting each printed citation of successiv years on a small separate card. Or, if printed on thin paper, each citation might be pasted in the dictionary on the margin of the page where it belongs, or all together on fly-leaves at the end of the volume.

REGISTER OF NEW WORDS

(NOT FOUND IN MURRAY'S HISTORICAL DICTIONARY, 1888).

abeach 1888 F. MARION CRAWFORD *With the Immortals* xiv Dread not the reef, as with long sweep you send Your ship abeach!

abrim 1887 LIZETTE W. REESE *Poems* 42 And there a thorn-bush stood, Astir with bees, abrim with blossoms gay.

acolytic 1887 WM. F. WARREN in *N. Y. Independent* May 12 p. 6 His [the preacher's] two acolytic serving-lads were properly cuddled down in the narrow corners behind him.

adamantologist 1861 *Congregationalist* (*Boston*) The most profound adamantologist in the world is the Duke of Brunswick.

adorant 1888 *The Nation* 29 March 262 Behind him stands a woman, while in front is an altar with an adorant.

adreaming 1861 JAMES PHINNEY *The Sword and the Plow* The meadows as green as green could be, All sweeping down to the muttering sea, Adreaming on its bed.

Digitized by Google

aflare 1886 MARY N. MURFREE *In the Clouds* xvii The flaming base of the opposite mountain, all luridly aflare in the windy dusk.

afleeting 1861 JAMES PHINNEY *The Sword and the Plow* I watched the clouds above Afleeting through the blue.

agrow 1887 LIZETTE W. REESE *Poems* 28 She stood and smiled. I did not know Which was the whitest thing in June, She, or that bush a-grow.

aliveness 1885 ARLO BATES *A Wheel of Fire* xii There's an air of — of — well, of aliveness about you that you don't have much nowadays.

aloose 1885 MARY N. MURFREE *Prophet of Smoky Mountains* ii His shifting eyes . . . betokened but little anxiety for the Principle of Evil aloose in the Big Smoky.

altitudinous 1888 *The Advance* Nov. 29 p. 771 That building has already reached its thirteenth story. . . . Perhaps it will rest awhile before aspiring to any more altitudinous distinction.

amatively 1883 C. L. NORTON in *The Continent* 17 Oct. 486 The practical jokers are indulging in their not always considerate devices, the amatively inclined making eyes at each other.

anacoluth 1850 J. T. CHAMPLIN *Kühner's Latin Grammar remodeled* 308 Anacoluths are of two kinds, grammatical and rhetorical.

anacoluthous 1850 E. A. JOHNSON *Notes on Cicero, Manil.* vii This sentence is anacoluthous.

apuff 1888 T. MUNSON COAN in *Harpers Young People* 3 Jan. 176 The hopeful youngster may be seen in the street, in all his pride, all apuff with cheap tobacco.

aquirk 1888 MARGARET E. DITTO in *Harpers Young People* 24 Jan. 227 All the baby is alive with laughter: . . . his ten toes are all awork and aquirk.

arbútus [Note the accent] 1886 MARY E. VANDYNE *The Revolt of the Flowers* She was followed by Arbutus, Who cried, "It's jolly here; I'm sure 'twould never suit us, That world so cold and drear."

ashimmer 1886 MARY N. MURFREE *In the Clouds* xiv It [a fir] was all a-shimmer with the frost.

athetize 1888 WALTER LEAF *The Iliad* ii 89 The line was athetized by . . . Aristophanes, but there is no obvious reason for its condemnation.

atime 1887 MARGARET E. DITTO in *Harpers Young People* 27 Dec. 143 Christmas. Every purpose and plan of her little round was atune and atime to that promised joy.

auditizing 1888 JOSEPH JASTROW in *Popular Sci. Monthly* Sept. 600 . . . persons who possess this "auditizing" power to an unusual degree . . . Mozart, who remembered the "Miserere" of the Sistine Chapel after two hearings.

avertive 1888 *Home Decoration* N. Y. May 12 The chief measures are avertive and not necessarily expensive.

awheel 1888 FRED WILSON in *Outing* for July An Irish Outing Awheel.

bald *sb* 1885 MARY N. MURFREE *Prophet of Smoky Mountains* xv Only the immaculate whiteness of those lofty regions of the balds withstood the thaw.

ballotorial 1883 A. W. TOURGEE in *The Continent* 17 Oct. 502 It proposed . . . to deprive those already voters of the ballotorial power.

bassy 1862 JOEL BENTON *The Humming Bird* in *N. Y. Independent* 12 June He hath no song: the bassy stir Of his wings' ceaseless mellow whirr Becomes his soul's interpreter.

bedlamish 1885 *The Buntling Ball* 48 Or is it a mere monomania, a bedlamish kind of caprice?

[**belligerency**] 1861 WM. H. SEWARD *Letter to Lord Lyons* 26

Digitized by Google

Dec. A judicial prosecution there in Admiralty which will try and decide the questions of belligerency, neutrality, contraband and capture.

beratement 1883 MARION HARLAND *Judith* xxiii She bent the energies of arm and tongue to her effort to help the horse up and to the salutary beratement of his owner.

betricked 1862 *N. Y. Independent* 9 Jan. Our flippant throng of betricked scribblers.

bewhimper 1887 GEORGE MEREDITH "To Children" in *Eng. Ill. Magazine* Dec. p. 184 He bewhimpered his welting, and I Scarce thought it enough for him.

blizzarded 1888 *The Independent* Feb. 16 Windy and blizzarded Chicago.

blizzardy 1888 *Iowa College News Letter* Jan. The almost unprecedented cold and blizzardy weather.

bonnetry 1861 W. H. RUSSELL *Letter to London Times* 19 Sept. Crinoline, yellow shawls, pink and white dresses, wonderful bonnetry and very quaint booting.

boodler 1886 *Chicago Tribune* 18 Dec. p. 4.

boomish 1889 In *Boston Transcript* Feb. Quite a boomish feeling in the air as the days go on lengthening.

bumming 1880 JOEL CHANDLER HARRIS *Uncle Remus' Songs* You better come now ef you comin'—Ole Satun is loose en a bummin'—De wheels er distruckshun is a hummin'.

bunkies 1887 MRS. E. B. CUSTER *Tenting on the Plains* (Title of a picture) Pine tree Rattler, Tarantula, Scorpion, Horned Toad, Centipede, Our Bunkies.

buttercupped 1888 MRS. H. WARD *Robert Elsmere* xliv a wavering rainy light played . . . over the butter-cupped river meadows.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

I. Proceedings of Twentieth Annual Session, Amherst, 1888.

II. Treasurer's Report (p. vii).

III. List of Officers and Members (p. xxxix).

IV. Constitution of the Association (p. lii).

V. Publications of the Association (p. liv).

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL SESSION (AMHERST).

Frederic D. Allen, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
E. C. Bissell, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.
Josiah Bridge, Cambridge, Mass.
Kate Holladay Claghorn, Brooklyn, N. Y.
William L. Cowles, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
C. T. Davis, Packer Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
William W. Eaton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Isaac Flagg, Westville, Conn.
Carlton A. Foote, New Haven, Conn.
Harold M. Fowler, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
Farley B. Goddard, Malden, Mass.
Julius Goebel, New York, N. Y.
Thomas D. Goodell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Isaac H. Hall, Metropolitan Museum, New York, N. Y.
Charles S. Halsey, Union Classical Institute, Schenectady, N. Y.
William McD. Halsey, New York, N. Y.
Caskie Harrison, Latin School, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Edward Southworth Hawes, Cathedral School of S. Paul, Garden City, N. Y.
John H. Hewitt, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Cambridge, Mass.
Andrew Ingraham, Swain Free School, New Bedford, Mass.
Martin Kellogg, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
William I. Knapp, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
William A. Merrill, Miami University, Oxford, O.
Morris H. Morgan, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Edward P. Morris, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
James Challis Parsons, Prospect Hill School, Greenfield, Mass.
James M. Paton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Ernest M. Pease, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Tracy Peck, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Bernadotte Perrin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
Samuel B. Platner, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
William Carey Poland, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Thomas R. Price, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
George M. Richardson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Digitized by Google

C. P. G. Scott, New York, N. Y.
Charles D. Seely, State Normal School, Brockport, N. Y.
William J. Seelye, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Thomas D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Joseph Alden Shaw, Highland Military Academy, Worcester, Mass.
Carl Siedhof, Jr., Boston, Mass.
M. S. Slaughter, Hackettstown Institute, Hackettstown, N. J.
Herbert Weir Smyth, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
James A. Towle, Robbins School, Norfolk, Conn.
James R. Wheeler, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Andrew C. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Horatio Stevens White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
J. Ernest Whitney, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Frank E. Woodruff, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Henry P. Wright, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

[Total, 55.]

Digitized by Google

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

AMHERST, MASS., Tuesday, July 10, 1888.

THE Twentieth Annual Session was called to order at 3.45 P.M., in Room 10, Walker Hall, Amherst College, by Professor Isaac H. Hall, of the Metropolitan Museum, New York, N. Y., President of the Association.

The Secretary, Professor John H. Wright, presented the following report of the Executive Committee: —

a. The Committee had elected as members of the Association: [1]

Charles A. Aiken, Professor of Oriental and Old Testament Literature, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
Timothy J. Barrett, Professor of Humanities, Boston College, Boston, Mass.
F. P. Brent, Onancock, Va.
Josiah Bridge, Ph. D., Cambridge, Mass.
Frank M. Bronson, Instructor in Greek and Latin, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Charles F. Castle, Professor of Greek, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
Charles Chandler, Professor of Latin, Denison University, Granville, O.
A. C. Chapin, Professor of Greek, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
Kate Holladay Claghorn, Brooklyn, N. Y.
David Y. Comstock, Professor of Latin, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
William L. Cowles, Assistant Professor of Latin, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Richard S. Colwell, Professor of Greek, Denison University, Granville, O.
Edward G. Coy, Professor of Greek, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
John M. Crow, Professor of Greek, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia.
William L. Cushing, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
Sanford L. Cutler, Principal of Lawrence Academy, Groton, Mass.
Howard Edwards, Professor in University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
Joseph Emerson, Professor of Greek, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
Arthur J. Evans, Professor of Greek, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
Thomas Fell, President of St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.
Paul C. Gandolfo, St. Louis, Mo.

[1] In this list are included the names of all persons elected to membership at the Twentieth Annual Session of the Association. The addresses given are, as far as can be, those of the winter of 1888-89.

Digitized by Google

Horace Goodhue, Jr., Professor of Greek, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.

Abby M. Goodwin, Associate Professor of Latin, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Randall C. Hall, Professor in the General Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.

Carter J. Harris, Professor of Latin, Washington-Lee University, Lexington, Va.

Edward Southworth Hawes, Cathedral School of S. Paul, Garden City, N. Y.

Addison Hogue, Professor in Hampden-Sidney College, Va.

William Houston, Toronto, Can.

W. I. Hunt, Tutor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Andrew Ingraham, Swain Free School, New Bedford, Mass.

Thomas W. Jordan, President of Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va.

R. V. Jones, Professor of Greek and Latin in Acadia College, Wolfeville, N. S.

William A. Lamberton, Professor of Greek, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

William Cranston Lawton, Cambridge, Mass.

Abby Leach, Associate Professor of Greek, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Gonzalez Lodge, Professor of Greek, Davidson College, N. C.

Frances E. Lord, Professor of Latin, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.

Charles Louis Loos, President of Kentucky University, Lexington, Ky.

B. C. Mathews, Newark, N. J.

J. T. Lees, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Frank G. Moore, Tutor in Latin, Yale University, Newhaven, Conn.

John Robert Moses, Rugby Academy, Philadelphia, Pa.

Samuel A. Martin, Professor of English, Lincoln University, Lincoln, Pa.

Frank W. Nicolson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

William H. H. Parks, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

James C. Parsons, Principal of Prospect Hill School, Greenfield, Mass.

Richard Parsons, Professor of Greek, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.

Calvin W. Pearson, Professor of Modern Languages, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

William Porter, Professor of Latin, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

Edward E. Phillips, Professor of Greek, Marietta College, Marietta, O.

Harley F. Roberts, Instructor in Norwich Free Academy, Norwich, Conn.

David H. Robinson, Professor of Latin, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.

William A. Robinson, Professor of Greek, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa.

Digitized by Google

Charles D. Seely, Instructor in State Normal School, Brockport, N. Y.
William J. Seelye, Instuctor in Greek, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Helen W. Shute, Instructor in German, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
Richard M. Smith, Professor of Greek, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.
Jonathan Y. Stanton, Professor of Greek and Latin, Bates College, Lewiston, Me.
M. Wilson Starling, Instructor in Greek, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.
L. K. Wharton, Liberty, Va.
J. Ernest Whitney, Instructor in English, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
E. Lincoln Wood, Instructor in Latin, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
W. G. Woodfin, Professor in Greek and Latin, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Charles Baker Wright, Professor of English, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.

[Total, 64.]

b. The Proceedings for the Nineteenth Annual Session (Burlington) and the Transactions for the same year (Vol. XVIII.) were in press, and would be issued in August or September.

c. In commenting upon the list of new members the Secretary took occasion to correct a misapprehension that prevails in certain quarters as to the nature and object of the Association. He reminded the members present that the Association exists for the purpose of promoting philological studies in the broadest sense of the term, which includes classical studies from the point of view of language, literature, history, and archaeology, as well as the other ancient and modern languages, linguistics, and comparative philology.

While many of the advantages of the Society are doubtless best secured by those who are present at the annual gatherings, the successful prosecution of its work, — the encouragement of philological studies in America and the publication of important contributions to the same, — is impossible without the coöperation of a much larger number of members than those who may be able regularly to attend the annual meetings.

Professor Wright also presented his report, as Treasurer of the Association, for the year ending July 7, 1888. The summary of accounts for 1887–88 is as follows: —

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, July 7, 1887		$579.88
Fees, assessments, and arrears paid in	$549.00	
Sales of Transactions and of Plates	204.56	
Total receipts for the year		753.56
		$1333.44

Digitized by Google

EXPENDITURES.

For Transactions (Vol. XVII.) and Proceedings for 1886:		
composition, printing, and distribution	$679.38	
For postages, stationery, job-printing, clerk-hire	85.07	
Interest on borrowed money, with partial payment ($50.00) .	81.80	
Total expenditures for the year		$846.25
Balance on hand, July 7, 1888		487.19
		$1333.44

The Chair appointed as Committee to audit the report, Professor C. Harrison and Dr. C. P. G. Scott.

The Committee to nominate officers for 1888–89 was also appointed: Professor F. A. March, Mr. L. H. Elwell, and Professor T. Peck.

At 4.10 P. M. the reading of communications was begun. At this time there were about thirty-five persons present: at the subsequent meetings the number averaged sixty.

1. A New Allegory in the First Book of the Faerie Queen, by J. Ernest Whitney, Esq., of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

2. The Changes in the Roman Constitution proposed by Cicero (Legg. iii. 3. 6–5. 12), by Professor W. A. Merrill, of Miami University, Oxford, O.

The purpose of the writer was to discover in Cicero's proposed law what constitutional usages had been already ratified by statute; what Cicero had legislated for the first time, being already sanctioned by use; and what changes had been proposed which were altogether new. Each division of the law was examined by itself, being quoted according to the recension of Baiter, 1865. All legal precedents were indicated by reference to ancient authors under each section of the law. The final result of the investigation resolved itself into four categories, as follows: —

1. Moral provisions, needing no statute: that magistracies should be legal; that promagistratus be upright, should restrain their cupidity, should increase the glory of Rome, should return home with honor; that the senate be faultless and an example to the people; that the senate's proceedings should be above criticism; the senator should not obstruct legislation and should be patriotic; that the peacemaker in public commotion be praiseworthy.

2. Legislation of customs probably existent: the number of magistratus to be flexible according to necessity; censors to prevent celibacy; senate to consist of former magistratus; senator to attend meetings of senate; the leader of a mob to be held responsible; magistratus to take auspices and to obey the augurs; the aediles to be of equal rank.

Digitized by Google

3. New provisions: the censor's active term to be five years, and the office to be filled always; all magistratus to have *iudicium;* the optimates to have oversight of popular suffrage; the censors to be custodians of the laws and auditors of the accounts of retiring magistrates; no restriction of consul's *imperium* to the field; tribuni militum constituted magistratus.

4. Provisions of doubtful or obscure novelty: consuls to be above law in time of public danger; tribunes freed from all restrictions; *magister equitum* to have the right of consulting the senate; the laws de ambitu and repetundarum of widest range; the senate to determine the number of praetors; the power of imprisonment, stripes, and fine given to holders of *imperium* subject to appeal at home, absolute to the field. In many cases the doubt arose from the condition of Cicero's text.

At 5 P. M. the Association adjourned to meet at 8 o'clock.

AMHERST, MASS., Tuesday, July 10, 1888.

EVENING SESSION.

The Association, with many residents of Amherst, assembled in the Athenae Room of Williston Hall of Amherst College at 8 P. M., Professor Thomas D. Seymour, one of the Vice-Presidents, in the chair.

The programme of papers for the remaining meetings of the Association, as arranged by the Executive Committee, was then read.

An invitation was extended to the members of the Association and their friends to visit the Library, Chapel, Observatory, Museums, and other collections of Amherst College.

The audience then listened to the annual address of the President of the Association.

3. The Legacy of the Syrian Scribes, by Professor Isaac H. Hall, of the Metropolitan Museum, New York.

Fifty-five years ago a young tutor in Amherst College, and her four-years-old graduate, received an appointment as one of the pioneer missionaries to the Nestorians in Persia. Detained at Andover by illness till his ship, which had waited at Boston in vain hopes of his recovery, was about to sail without him, he insisted upon being carried on a bed twenty miles in a wagon, lifted on board the vessel at the last moment, and taking the desperate chance of surviving the voyage to the Mediterranean.

To all appearance he was destined to a watery grave. But God otherwise willed it. The young man lived. After untold privations, distresses and obstacles he reached his field of labor, gained the hearts of the people, won the confidence of princes (and, still harder, of bigoted ecclesiastics), dwelt as a brother

Digitized by Google

among the semi-savage tribes — the same indomitables who anciently so harassed Xenophon in the Retreat of the Ten Thousand, spent a long and prosperous life in the diffusion of light and truth, and left behind him a civilized and intelligent cluster of communities, who bless him to this day for the noble harvest of the past and the radiant prospect of the future.

This was Justin Perkins, to whom, in his philanthropic zeal, it seemed a secondary matter that he gave writing and print to the Modern-Syriac-speaking peoples, reducing their language for the first time to a written form; that he translated the Bible into their native tongue, producing a work to which Europeans gladly go as the main source in a large branch of Semitic science; that he became the father of a great, a varied, and an excellent literature in that tongue; that he gained imperishable fame among the higher scholars of the world of letters, besides helping them to greatly longed-for stores in manuscript of the ancient language.

On the occasion of meeting at the college which justly experiences the joy of such an illustrious son — not to speak of his efficient comrades, of whom a number are likewise her alumni — it has seemed that no more fitting subject could be chosen for to-night than a rapid look at those ancient labors into which Perkins and his comrades entered, and which they loved so well: the literary legacy of the Syrian scribes.

The "legacy" was defined as the actual remains at hand, without conjectural restorations of the whole language and literature, and without paying much attention to the Oroomia dialect, the Turani, the Fellahi, the Tiyari, the Mandaean, or other cloven fragments of the ancient spoken tongue, some of which, as Nöldeke has shown, are not the lineal daughters of the ancient Syriac, but of a still older member of the Semitic family, and which therefore cannot safely be neglected by the Assyriologist, though less interesting in a literary point of view. The early fragments of the language in the book of Genesis, and its overflowings in Phoenician, Hebrew, and the later language of the Talmud were passed over in briefest mention. The literature in its remains begins at about the time of Christ; its golden age continues to about the fifth or sixth century, having its literary capital at Edessa and its provinces from the Mediterranean and the Bosporus to the Persian Gulf and beyond the Euphrates; its writers in the West often speaking and writing both Greek and Latin as well as Syriac, while in the East they did the same with Persian and certain of the Indian and Tatar tongues. At the rise of Islam the language met the overflow of the great South-Semitic tongue, the Arabic, and thenceforward, till the decay of the language as a literary and spoken tongue (*i.e.* 12th to 14th century), the masters in Syriac literature frequently wrote and spoke with equal ease the Syriac, the Arabic, and the Greek.

Further, with the exception of a brilliant heathen school, whose works have mostly perished, the Syriac literati were mostly Christian, planting their missions as far away as the heart of China and the coast of Malabar, and sending their hymnology westward to Gaul and southward to Nubia, having Greek and Roman civilization as their neighbor on the left, and on their right the barbarism of Kûrds, Turks, Huns and Tatars. It follows that the Syriac language necessarily possesses a kind and degree of development not shared by the other Semitic tongues, at once maintaining a peculiar character and comprising literary stores of a varied and valuable sort. We find the fables of Bidpai imported from the Sanskrit, the

Digitized by Google

story of Sindban from the Persian, the masterpieces of Greek literature from the West; and it is not more strange to meet a Persian, Indian or Kûrdish word on a Syriac page than the throngs of Greek and Latin words, with the adoption even of Greek particles. Nor is it surprising to find the Syriac the most flexible and variously shaded of all the Semitic languages. The ancient Syriac literature is frequently said to be not an attractive one; but that is true of its belles-lettres aspect only. Until the matchless Lucian — himself a Syrian of Shemshat, or Samosata, and full of Syriac ideas and idioms — is no more printed or read, until Josephus — whose imitations of Demosthenes and Thucydides are mingled inseparably with his native Syriac constructions and word-usages — is shelved, and with him the Greek Christian fathers and the Byzantine historians, not to mention the older Greek Christian hymns, often borrowed from the Syriac, — until then, it is safe to say, the Syriac language will retain its hold upon its loving students.

The great office of the Syriac literature, however, was the transmission of the Bible, along with the choicest Greek and Latin classics, the Greek writers on philosophy and science, and the Greek Christian fathers, from the West to the East; and thus, in the later centuries, to pass on the light of the Occidentals to the Arabic-speaking peoples. Through this channel flowed most of the lore of the Greeks to all the nations of the East; including no mean portion of the later learning of the Egyptians. Translations of the Roman civil laws likewise carried over to all the Oriental Christians their systems of civil and ecclesiastical law, with the general doctrine of public and private rights. It is this great fact that makes the Syriac literature not only indispensable to the Biblical critic, but of the last importance to the Hellenist.

This point was much enlarged upon, showing the text-critical, lexical, grammatical, epigraphical and other importance of the Syriac literature to the Hellenist, especially in matters which the ordinary Hellenist little suspects. Not the least important is the testimony to the pronunciation of Greek words and letters, to say nothing of the adoption of multitudes of Greek words into Syriac, made while both tongues were living in the same mouth, and continuing through the whole period from Ptolemaic times downward.

The Syrian scribes are said to have copied the Greek even in the arrangement of their writing materials and their book-making. It is further certainly true that notwithstanding the differences existing between the two tongues, the Syriac grammarians, synonym-compilers, and perhaps lexicographers, for many centuries followed the pattern of the Greek authors in the same lines; often actually translating into Syriac long passages from a Greek grammarian or lexicographer — since the linguistic facts were the same in both, or at least, susceptible of uttering nearly the same cries under the torture of dogmatic grammarians. . . .

How many Greek scholars are aware that James of Edessa in the 8th century substituted the Greek vowels for the native vowel points in the Syriac writing, and thus preserved, in their transmission to this day, the common Greek pronunciation that had ruled for many ages before that of James? My own experience is that this fact, notorious among even the tiros in Syriac, is received with utter incredulity by most Hellenists, who find it a hard saying because it discloses facts that contradict their phonetic theories.

Yet — not to lay stress upon that — when a Greek author, extant in the original

Digitized by Google

in but one or two faulty MSS., is extant abundantly in Syriac translation (and this is by no means a rare phenomenon), it were a shame to neglect the latter as a source either of text-criticism or commentary. Nor is such neglect the habit of that broadest class of scholars, the text-critics of the New Testament, whose science, like astronomy among the metaphysico-natural sciences, is among book-sciences the very aristocrat, making the most imperative and exhaustive demands upon every branch of human knowledge, and acting as the sole stimulus to force many a branch to its highest eminence. Nor is such neglect suffered by the best editors of the text of Aristotle and sundry other Greek classics and the Greek Christian fathers, any more than it will be neglected in other branches of Greek scholarship when Hellenists generally shall know how much they have to gain from the Syrian scribes. Not to mention the Syriac translations of the Iliad and Odyssey, in bulk now lost, but of which scraps are floating round in the extant literature, the Greek works on linguistic science, on philosophy, on natural science and medicine, are largely extant in Syriac, contributing an immense amount to Greek technical and general scholarship in matters which are scarcely to be restored from Greek remains alone. . . . Josephus, whose entrancing narrative of the Jewish wars presents the most familiar specimen of an outside view of Roman history, is an author whose lexicography (even) has never been respectably worked up by our master Hellenists; and it never can be done without some knowledge of and sympathy with his native idiom.

This broad stream in the extant Syriac literature, which carried the wisdom of the Greeks over to the Euphrates, and with it a number of fragments of Latin historians whose originals have been lost, is in itself enough to repay special exploration; and any Hellenist who will try it will find himself richly rewarded, though he will not now be everywhere a pioneer.

This field of work was further recommended because of the antiquity of the Syriac documents concerned, generally far superior to that of the original Greek MSS., by the abundance of desirable and refreshing results sure to be obtained by the modest investigator, by the good sense and high-toned brotherhood of the scholars of various nationalities engaged in such labor, and the honorable distinction already attained by the pioneers in the service.

In a fragment of the early Roman historian Diocles, extant now in Syriac only, is preserved the pretty story of Hercules on the sea-shore of Tyre; how he saw a shepherd's dog eat the shell-fish called *conchylium*, and stain his mouth with the purple blood; how he told the shepherd, who wiped the dog's mouth with wool, and of the wool made a wreath, and put it on his head. And when the sun shone upon it Hercules saw the wreath, that it was very radiant, and he was astonished at its beauty, and he took the wreath and wore it. Thus he discovered the art of the Tyrian purple, and reserved it for the Tyrian kings, his worshippers. And this Hercules taught the dyeing of all beautiful colors, and showed and taught men how pearls go up from the sea. The Hellenist who covets the reputation of such a Hercules need not break many shells on the shore of this Syrian flood before he will learn how beautiful hues and attractive pearls will come up from the sea to adorn his already matchless Grecian fabrics.

Though to Occidentals the Syriac translations of the Bible fill the largest horizon in that literature, the notice of them was necessarily brief, although the Syriac

Digitized by Google

MSS., as a class, are the oldest Biblical MSS. extant, and their value and importance of the highest. The Peshitto Old Testament, whose genesis and age are still a problem, appears, on the whole, to be the oldest of the Targums, and, as a translation, second in antiquity only to the Septuagint. It would seem to have been a Jewish work, with later Christian emendations. . . . The origin of the Peshitto New Testament rests in almost equal obscurity, though that it is a revision of an older version seems now beyond question, notwithstanding the crazy dreams of at least one Continental scholar, and the obstinate declarations of some hide-bound English unclubbables. The Old and the New Peshitto Testaments are two very different things: the Old, a mixture of targumic exposition and translation; the New an elegant, sweet, and flowing translation scarcely equalled in literary merit or fidelity; the English and German being its only rivals. Invaluable as it is to textual critics, it is still more so to interpreters.

The Philoxenian and its revision, the Harclensian, and the Hexaplar, were briefly touched upon, with a note of their immense value in textual criticism, along with the Karkaphensian, which a series of MSS. show to have been either a collection of Peshitto and Harclensian Bibles vocalized by scholars of the monastery of Karkaphta, or else a collection of ("Massoretic") MSS. recording the vocalization in disputed cases, or else of both classes together. The MSS. were briefly remarked upon, along with the Nestorian Bible of the American missionaries at Oroomia, which is the great philological authority in its line for all Syriac scholars.

The native literature was treated of in a manner too varied and (necessarily) cursory to be summarized briefly. The fact that the literature still exists mostly in manuscript only was dwelt upon, as an incentive to the diligence of editors, and an excellent opportunity for the descendants of Maecenas. Fortunately the cataloguing of the library treasures of this literature has been done mainly by men of the most able and enlightened character; the resulting works, bibliographical in the most generous sense, being such as few other literatures can boast, and likewise the delight and reliance of students in other branches than Syriac. Moreover, ever since the language began to be studied in the West, there has been a knot of competent scholars gathered near all the chief MSS. collections, whose generosity in furnishing transcriptions or collations, in making and securing loans of valuable documents, has been of the most lovely and praiseworthy sort. The brotherhood of Syriac scholars has been almost perfect; from the beginning scarcely impeded even by sectarian prejudice or religious bigotry — of which striking examples were given.

The romance of the vicissitudes of the MSS. was touched upon, especially the history of the library of the monastery of St. Mary Deipara, in the Nitrian desert, now in the British Museum — the story of which, with that of the exciting discoveries which followed its arrival in England, may be read in Wright's introduction to the "Homilies of Aphraates the Persian," in Cureton's famous article in the *Quarterly Review* for December, 1845, or in the preface to his "Festal Letters of Athanasius," and in Wright's "Catalogue of the Syriac MSS." in the British Museum. The stores in MSS. of the literature, and those which might yet be gleaned from the Tûr Abdîn, the Nestorian mountains, were spoken of, with some remark upon the hindrances which delay or prevent publication of MS. texts, caused mainly through charlatanism in other branches. The autochthonic Syriac

Digitized by Google

literature was next dwelt upon, with numerous examples from the various Syriac masters from Ephraim down to Bar Hebraeus, — from the early commentaries, hymns and homilies, to the chronicles of the crusades, among which the "Dies Irae" of the Nestorians was made the subject of especial remark, — as were likewise John of Ephesus, Joshua the Stylite, and others of scarcely less moment, sources of which Gibbon on the one hand and Neander on the other would have been only too glad to have availed themselves. In their place came mention of the eloquent epistolary writers, and of the romances, whose plots clustered about events in the time of Constantine and Julian, which certain Arab historians have actually taken and used as sober history.

In the whole, the range was wide; and the purpose chiefly to show the place and the setting of the Syriac remains in the world's literature, abandoning the idea of an outline sketch of even a branch of the extant literature. Until Hellenists generally know how much they have to gain in all directions from the Syriac remains, until the lovers of hymnology and a sound moral literature know both how much they owe to the Syrians and how much they might glean therefrom, until historians both secular and ecclesiastical discover how much material they have overlooked, or underrated, or passed oblivious by, — it is probable that the majority of the learned in other branches will continue to look upon the Syriac merely as a handmaid to the Biblical student, the palaeographer or the archaeologist; as a far off thing of little use or influence, — instead of, as it is, a rich repository of truth — linguistic, literary, historical and philosophic, not to say scientific — that shall make men intellectually free. Were it only that one might read the chronicles of Abulfaraj, or, to call him by his other name, John bar Ebraya Gregory, primate of the East, the man whose wonderful abilities and attainments threw up the last grand blaze of the expiring candle of Syriac literature, the elegant writer of the Arabic as well as the Syriac tongue, the poet, physician, historian, philosopher and divine, who would have been an ornament to any age no less than the wonder of his own troubled period, at whose grave the Nestorian patriarch, his rival, with a train of Greeks and Armenians forgot their disputes and mingled their tears over the bier of an enemy, — were it only to read the chronicles alone, out of the voluminous and varied works of this versatile wonder, the trouble of acquiring the Syriac language would be well repaid.

But those of us who can remember when the study of Syriac in this country was a most solitary and sporadic thing, when Murdock's translation of the Peshitto New Testament was looked upon as a superfluous bit of wasteful scholarly amusement, when it was next to impossible to get a Syriac word set up at any printing house in the country, and when generally the Syriac scholar was pitied or scorned as having lost all sense of practical affairs, if not as a barterer of his brains for outlandish rubbish, — we who remember all this, and reflect that now one may be guilty of editing a Syriac text in America without being judged a candidate for a public asylum, and can even have it printed in Syriac type in this country; that it is now scarcely harder for a Syriac scholar to gain the ear of a Hellenist than for a Hellenist to gain the ear of a scientific student who sees no good in the study of Greek — we, who thus remember and see, take courage, and look with hope for the time when a work like that of Justin Perkins in the East shall have its counterpart in his home in the West; when the treasures of this literature shall

Digitized by Google

take on the permanence of print under conscientious editorship, and that which is available therefor shall find its way down through translations into the channels of common diffusion; when the stores now mouldering in their ancient repositories shall be brought at length to light, and — since every effort in these directions spreads the English tongue in the East — when a new life shall arise in those regions by the spread of the Western languages; and when, finally, a vigorous band of American scholars shall, by their very weight, impetus and vitality, put an eternal quietus on the wretched *cui bono* interrogatory of ignorance and prejudice.

To such vigorous scholars, self-denying champions in mental and moral warfare, though oftener to the martyr or religious hero, the Syrians gave the borrowed name of "athletes," using the term ever in its highest and noblest sense. To the day when a generation of such athletes shall arise in our universities for power and progress we look forward with earnest desire and hope.

At the close of the address, at 9.30 P. M., the Association adjourned to 9.30 A. M., Wednesday.

AMHERST, MASS., Wednesday, July 11, 1888.

MORNING SESSION.

The Association was called to order at 10 A. M., by Professor I. H. Hall, the President.

The Association was invited to attend a reception, given in its honor, at the Chapter-house of the Psi Upsilon Fraternity, by Mr. and Mrs. Elwell, on Thursday evening, July 12.

The invitation was accepted with thanks.

The reading of communications was then resumed.

4. Cure Inscriptions from Epidaurus,[1] by James R. Wheeler, Ph. D., of Cambridge, Mass.

These inscriptions were considered as illustrating a phase of Hellenic civilization and as exemplifying the forms of Aesculapian Worship. The larger part of the cures themselves were translated and compared with the *locus classicus* on *incubation* from the Plutus of Aristophanes. The truth of the poet's description is borne out even into details by the inscriptions. Nos. 5, 9, 17 among the cures recorded in the first inscription stand in especially close relation to the scene from the Plutus. Especially noteworthy is the cure of Aristagora of Troezen in the second inscription, since a similar cure is recorded in a fragment of the historian Hippys of Rhegium (Aelian H. A. IX. 33). Cf. Kavvadias in the Ἐφημερὶς and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Hermes XIX. p. 45, who take different views of the relation between the fragment and the inscription. Data are insufficient for a certain conclusion on this point.

Remarks were made by Dr. H. W. Smyth.

[1] Ἐφημερὶς ἀρχαιολογική, 1883, pp. 211 ff.; 1885, pp. 2 ff. *Cf.* Pausanias, ii. 27. 3.

Digitized by Google

5. English Pronunciation, How Learned, by Professor Francis A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

Our pronouncing dictionaries giv the full, distinct sounds of English words as utterd by traind orators speaking them with emfasis. In American schools this pronunciation is carefully taught, and it constitutes the primary concept of the word. In speaking we wil to sound this concept. But the law of least effort works, and in conversation especially we do not use energy enuf to put the organs of speech thru the proper movements, or send up volume of voice sufficient to bring out the resonance of the vowel chambers. The same letter in different words, the same word in different relations to accent, emfasis, and feeling, varies freely by shades of sound so delicate that no notation can giv them. The speech is, as J. Grimm says, nicht einmal lehrbaren, nur lernbaren.

It has been common to teach foreners the standard pronunciation, and let them catch the conversational weakenings. But lately it has been proposed to teach conversational pronunciation as primary English. The sentence is taken as a unit, and sentences ar caught by imitation of their colloquial utterance in London. It is denied that there is any such speech as the standard speech of the dictionaries.

In answer to this it was said that the standard speech exists in the concepts of educated persons, and is embodied in literature, in the rhythms and rimes of the great poets. With such persons the variations from the standard sounds ar weakenings; the concept is present, the organs move. An attentive listener close before them can distinguish each letter. They ar easily distinguisht from illiterates who leav their organs in the neutral position, and positively make the neutral vowel of *but* or *burr* for any unaccented vowel, and make no movement to articulate many consonants.

Colloquial pronunciation is not fixt for particular sentences, much less for literature. Contractions, weakenings, ar used or not according to the feeling of the moment, the ernestness or levity of the speaker, the connection suggesting distinctness or plesant rhythm, the persons addresst, and other causes.

The colloquial speech of different regions is different. Untraind popular orators from England, whose oratory is only a loud utterance of their colloquial articulation, ar not easily understood by American audiences, but when scholars do us the honor of addressing the Philological Association, nobody notices their pronunciation as peculiar. A Frenchman or German who was grounded first in the London colloquial, and had no guiding concepts of the standard pronunciation, would be thereby markt in America as a forener, and an illiterate one.

Remarks were made upon the subject of the paper by Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Esq., and Professor W. A. Merrill.

6. Goethe's Homeric Studies, by George M. Richardson, Ph. D., of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Though Goethe's "Homeric Studies" cut a very modest figure beside those of Aristarchus, it is not without interest to inquire, how much study the last

Digitized by Google

world-poet bestowed on the first, and what he gained from studying him. There are two points of contact between Goethe and Homer, both, naturally, on the aesthetic side. The first concerns itself with the direct influence of the Greek on the German poet, an influence dating from Goethe's intercourse with Herder in Strassburg, in 1770. Through the association with this remarkable man came the momentous change which completely overthrew Goethe's previous views of literary art, and in producing this change Homer, with Shakespeare, was the factor of most importance. From Herder, Goethe first learned what was to be the countersign of the age: "Return to Nature." This doctrine, preached on its political side by Rousseau, Herder applied to literature. The watchword was, as Vilmar says, that a return must be made to an original, simple, unartificial poetry of the people; that in Shakespeare was to be revered a great, but in Homer the greatest, of models. Hampered no longer by the "Three Unities," or any other hard and fast formula, was the poet to sing, but obeying only the natural, creative impulse from within, regardless of all else. To Homer, it is not too much to say, Goethe largely owed his literary regeneration, a fact surely worthy the notice of classical philologists. And henceforward a devotion to Homer accompanied him through life.

In 1781 Voss' translation of the Odyssey appeared, twelve years later a revised version and the Iliad. Voss' work won, on the whole, Goethe's approval, and during the year 1794 he read selections from Voss' Iliad on certain evenings to a circle of literary friends. After the reading came a discussion of the merits of the version as compared with previous ones, and critical observations were made on particular points.

Amid this active study of Homer on Goethe's part there appeared in the following year, 1795, Wolf's *Prolegomena ad Homerum*, a work that produced not merely among scholars, but through the literary circles of all Germany, a sensation never equalled before or since. Goethe, in obedience to the wishes of Wilhelm von Humboldt, an intimate friend of Wolf, gave careful study to the *Prolegomena*, but at first his feeling as a poet prevailed over his understanding. It seemed to him a blasphemous undertaking to destroy the identity of the one great Homer, who had been a beacon to him for more than twenty years. But gradually the critical spirit and method of the work began to win him over, for he was ever open to conviction and an admirer by nature of a vigorously logical treatment of any subject.

In a letter to Wolf, of Dec. 26th, 1796 (No. 2 in Bernay's "Goethe's Briefe an Friedrich August Wolf"), he confesses how great the influence of the *Prolegomena* has been on him, and how much he owes to the conviction impressed on him by Wolf's investigations. For these investigations, destructive as they might seem as regards Homer, had had on the poet a most positive influence, and directly inspired him to the production of a new work. And this brings us to the second point of connection between Goethe and Homer, for here Goethe's literary development is indissolubly bound up with the "Homeric Question." How, his own words will best explain: "Perhaps," he says, "I may soon send you with more courage the announcement of an epic poem, in which I do not conceal how much I owe to the conviction you have so firmly impressed on me. For a long time since I was desirous of trying my hand in this direction, but the lofty idea

Digitized by Google

of the unity and the indivisibility of the writing of Homer frightened me from the attempt. Now, however, that you have shown these glorious works to belong to a family of singers (Homerids), the attempt in a more numerous company is less daring, and we may follow the way Voss has so beautifully pointed out in his 'Luise.' As I am not able to decide on the merits of your book theoretically, I only hope you may not be dissatisfied with this practical approval. For the active man wishes not merely to convince, but to influence, and this pleasure you experience in your pupils every day." By the "announcement of an epic poem" is meant the elegy "Hermann und Dorothea," which was intended to serve as an introduction to the epic of the same name. In it occurs the famous passage in which Goethe proclaims to the world his debt to Wolf: "Erst die Gesundheit des Mannes, der endlich von Namen Homeros," etc. Thus by a curious process the epic "Hermann und Dorothea" presents itself, to use Bernay's expression, as a happy and wonderful fruit of philological criticism. It illustrates how all the great lights of the golden days of German literature, poets and scholars alike, worked together, and were mutually helpful.

But Goethe was a poet and not a critic, after all, and in spite of his conversion here openly proclaimed, he again reverted to the view of the one Homer. Again he became a "Wolfianer," but he finally returned to the "Unitarian" fold. With following out his different moods on Homer and the Homeric Question we need not concern ourselves here. Suffice it to have shown that his devotion to Homer was serious and long continued, and that it is not a mere phrase to speak of "Goethe's Homeric Studies."

7. Volapük, and the Law of Least Effort, by Professor Francis A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

The case endings, personal endings, and other relational signs ar in Volapük vowels or syllabls. Each syllabl is easy to pronounce, if the vowels ar familiar; but the words ar long, and therefore demand much time and effort to pronounce. If Volapük should become a spoken language, the law of least effort would rapidly draw the sounds together according to phonetic laws, and destroy the uniform relation between sound and sense, which is one of its principal claims to excellence.

The objections against languages which ar synthetic and compound freely, lie against Volapük. The mind is entangld in the meanings of the parts of the words, and kept from simpl scrutiny of objects. Volapük does not attempt scientific connotation in its newly formd words, but repeats, for the most part, the old haphazard etymological descriptivs.

8. Theories of English Verse, by the Rev. James Challis Parsons, of the Prospect Hill School, Greenfield, Mass.

The theories we propose to consider relate wholly to the *rhythm* of English verse. We are to disregard, in this discussion, the varied and important effects of tone-color, and confine our attention to that *regularity of movement* which distinguishes verse from prose.

Digitized by Google

Two theories are before us. The first and most commonly prevalent regards *accent* as the basis of English rhythm; the second, occasionally advocated, holds that our rhythm is based upon the *length* of syllables.

The latter theory, which opposes the common judgment, has within a few years been set forth with an attempt at scientific demonstration by the late Mr. Sidney Lanier. His claim is that in reading verse our speech moves along by the same law as in music, as far as the rhythm is concerned; that is, it is not only divided into measures occupying equal times, but also all the syllables within the measures have exact time-ratios with each other. He gives copious illustrations of verse thus marked with musical notation.

The obvious objection to this theory is, that while verse may be thus marked and read with a certain effect, it is not the natural and normal way of reading. "In speech," says Mr. A. J. Ellis,[1] "length is so unappreciable that any attempt to prolong a phrase for a measurable duration destroys the speaking and introduces the singing character."

The only argument offered by Mr. Lanier in support of this theory is the assertion that all English syllables, in prose or verse, have the exact ratio to each other expressed by the numbers 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, etc.

This statement seems incredible. The relative length of syllables must depend upon the number of their phonetic elements and their greater or less difficulty of utterance. Of course, the absolute time taken may be arbitrarily adjusted, but at a given rate of utterance the relative time must depend upon the conditions above stated. Now in English we have eight vowels and four diphthongs, each of which may constitute a syllable, and with these may be combined from one to seven of twenty consonantal sounds, differing not only singly in difficulty of utterance, but also in the combinations which they may form. The ratios, therefore, cannot be so simple as is claimed.

In the examples given by Mr. Lanier, in which he contends that his method of marking expresses the instinct of the ordinary ear, it seems plain that it is only the division into groups by the natural accent which thus appeals to the ear, and not the arbitrary allotment of time which he gives to the syllables within the groups.

This theory of quantity in English verse disregards the differentiation which has taken place between music and poetry since the classic age. At first, rhythmic language in poetry had not yet separated itself from the rude accompaniment of song and dance. Music was capable of little more variation than was sufficient to mark the rhythms of verse. But gradually pure tone and articulate speech began to differentiate into their separate functions. Pure tone — in music — has gone on attaining to an elaboration of expression which gives it power to utter all the indefinable emotions of humanity. Articulate speech, on the other hand, has reserved to itself the expression of rational and definite thought, with only so much of emotion or imagination as can be associated with definite thought. Music, with its abnormal prolongations and variations of tone, is more and more devoted purely to emotion and sentiment. Poetry, as the vehicle of imagination or emotional *thought*, restricts itself more and more to the limits of ordinary articulate speech.

[1] *Trans. Phil. Soc.*, London, 1873-4, p. 121.

Digitized by Google

In prose, we have this ordinary speech in its unrhythmical form. In poetry, the heightened emotion instinctively expresses itself in moods of alternate exaltation and depression: the rhythm of feeling clothing itself in rhythm of form.

A true theory of English rhythm, then, would seem to be as follows: Rhythm, in language, is the recurrence of similar phenomena of sound at regular intervals of time. These intervals are practically equal. Now, whatever the phenomena may be which occur with regularity, the basis or material which is marked off is time. Quantity, thus far, is the basis of all prosody, — namely, in the equality of the intervals.

But when we come to consider the phenomena which mark off the intervals, we find those peculiarities of age and race to which reference has been made. Each age or race will instinctively employ such phenomenon to mark the rhythm as is most noticeable in the character of the vernacular. In the Germanic languages, to which our own belongs, the most noticeable feature of common speech is the accent. "The English language," says Hodgson, "plants its foot firmly down on a stressed syllable, and leaves the other syllables to shift for themselves." This tendency, with all its rude force, is seen in the Anglo-Saxon. Accent, heightened by alliteration, rules with rough energy with little regard to the syllables which intervene. In modern English the rhythm has become moulded into greater symmetry of movement, but is still characterized by a peculiar freedom and vigor. Its chief charm, as distinguished from the ancient, is that *it is not hampered by close attention to the relative length of the syllables of which it is composed.* It differs from the Greek not only in the indeterminate character of its intermediate syllables, but also in the prevalence of preliminary or final flourishes before or after the strictly metrical portion of the line of verse.

But with all the freedom of English rhythm, it still has its law of definite measure. This follows from the nature of accent. The office of accent is to fix attention upon the significant syllables. But the other syllables cannot be wholly neglected as modifiers of the meaning. They must receive some attention of speaker and hearer. Thus the number of such unaccented syllables which can go with the accented as modifiers is limited. Practically, not more than two such modifiers can be carried easily and clearly by any accented syllable. They may go before it (proclitics), as serenáde; or after it (enclitics), as ártlessly. In this way a unit of rhythm is constituted. This unit may be an accented rhythm with one unaccented syllable before or after it, or it may be an accented syllable with two unaccented before it or after it. In the former, we have double movement; in the latter, triple movement. We have thus four normal units of rhythm.

There is no good reason why these should not retain the classical names of feet, — namely, iambus and trochee, anapaest and dactyl. But there are, besides these, some varieties. As in marking time with the feet, in marching step, we may occasionally give equal ictus on both the right foot and the left during one measure, we may in verse throw equal stress upon each of two syllables in a foot, and thus produce the spondee. In like manner we may remit the usual ictus during one measure, — the rhythm being sufficiently carried on in the mind, — and thus obtain the pyrrhic.

In triple movement we find also the amphibrach and amphimacer in some of our best poets. Even a choriambus has its place without violating the primary

Digitized by Google

law of accent, as before stated. As to the kinds of rhythm most acceptable to the genius of our language, we have the judgment of Swinburne, that "in English all variations and combinations of anapaestic, iambic, or trochaic metre are as natural and pliable as all dactylic and spondaic forms of verse are unnatural and abhorrent."

Remarks were made upon the paper by Professors T. D. Goodell, and F. A. March.

Professor Goodell said: —

Lanier's opponents are entirely successful in controverting a thesis which neither Lanier nor any follower of his has ever maintained. Thus Whitney (Proceedings of this Assoc., 1885, p. vii. f.): "Hence, measure being postulated as a common fundamental element, the method of its establishment in Greek and English respectively has all the difference ever claimed for it . . . and Lanier's attempt to explain away this difference is a failure." So in the paper just read Lanier is said to hold that "our rhythm is based on the *length* of syllables" — *i.e.*, inherent and unchanging or but slightly changing length, as in Greek. This is distinct misinterpretation, and betrays superficial reading. See, *e.g.*, Science of Eng. Verse, pp. 68 f. and 78, second paragraph, where Lanier makes it very plain that he holds no such doctrine. What Lanier and his adherents describe is not primarily the "method of establishment" of measure, but the *measure itself after it is established.* And here we are nearer agreement than Lanier's opponents imagine. For it is now generally admitted, as in the paper just read, that our verse is at least in so far quantitative, that practically equal intervals of time are marked off by the recurring ictuses. So far we all agree. Our difference begins at the next step. Lanier and his followers hear in ordinary unforced reading, and mark in their notation, not only this equality of feet, but also definite time-relations between the separate syllables of each foot — just such time-relations as give to music its varying character as in double or triple time. To disregard these relations between the individual syllables and mark merely the ictuses is like saying that in music, while the bars are equal, the relative length of the individual notes in each bar is incapable of measurement by the ear, and is wholly indifferent, provided only the bars be equal. But our opponents say: We do not hear, our ears cannot measure, any definite time-relations between the individual syllables of the foot; therefore such definite relations do not exist, and the distinction which you maintain between verse in double and verse in triple time is imaginary. This is a *non sequitur*. Many people cannot detect the like distinctions in music; yet they exist. For those whose consciousness of rhythm and ability to record it when heard have never been developed, either by musical study or by training in *genuinely quantitative* reading of classic verse, some mechanical contrivance for presenting the rhythm of speech to the eye would be a help; those whose consciousness of rhythm has been developed in either of the ways mentioned do not ask for such demonstration, but are convinced by the evidence of the ear. But the fundamental character of the rhythm of such poems as Lamb's "Old Familiar Faces," Browning's Cavalier's song, "Give a Rouse," and many others which we describe as in double time and which all feel to be in some way peculiar, is utterly

Digitized by Google

incapable of explanation or rational description by any method which disregards the relative length of the syllables. Let some opponent of Lanier try his hand in describing the rhythm of one of them in detail.

At 1 P. M. the Association adjourned, to meet at 2.30 P. M.

AMHERST, MASS., Wednesday, July 11, 1888.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Association was called to order at 2.45 P. M. by Professor Thomas D. Seymour, Vice-President.

9. A Consideration of the Method Employed in Lighting the Vestal Fire,[1] by Morris H. Morgan, Ph. D., of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

The Vestal fire was freshly kindled every year on the first of March (Ov. F. 3. 135 sqq., Macr. S. 1. 12. 6). The writers have left us no information about the method employed. As a pure flame was wanted, it could be obtained from no other fire, but must have been got in one of the four ways known to the ancients, viz.: 1) Rubbing together of wood. 2) Boring of one piece of wood by another. 3) Friction of stones. 4) From the sun's rays. The method was probably the same as that employed when the fire was accidentally extinguished. On this point we have the testimony in Festus (s. vv. Ignis Vestae), who says it was that of boring. We should naturally expect that all the rites connected with the Vestal worship would be of the most archaic character, and this statement in Festus is therefore credible. On the other hand, the method described in Plutarch's Life of Numa, chapter 9, is in itself incredible, because the lighting of fire from the sun's rays was comparatively a modern invention. Further, this passage is full of mistakes in history, so that it may be deemed from *ἐὰν δὲ ὑπὸ τύχης* through *τῆς αὐγῆς λαβούσης* a pure interpolation. It may be, also, that the words refer to Greece and not to Rome at all. A third passage in Julian (Oration on the Sun, p. 155 A) is deserving of no greater confidence. It probably refers to the Vestal fire in Byzantium.

The discussion of Mr. Parsons's paper on Theories of English Verse was continued by Professors March and T. R. Price, and by Mr. Parsons.

Professor Price said: —

Exact observation, made with scientific instruments of precision, *e.g.* phonometer, on the sounds of English syllables, has entirely destroyed the belief, and

[1] A full discussion of the passages cited in this paper is found in Dr. Morgan's article on ancient methods of lighting fire, in the *Harvard Classical Studies*, Vol. I.

Digitized by Google

the possibility of belief, in any exact ratio among the quantities of English syllables as used in verse.

In all real poetry, as distinguished from mere mechanical verse, there is a tendency to make the stressed syllables coincide with vowel length, and to keep unstressed syllables short: this is the ideal of English verse, never, perhaps, completely attained, but always to be aimed at: in proportion as this ideal is attained, there comes to be in English poetry something of a quantitative balance in the movement of stressed and unstressed syllables.

10. Peculiarities of Affix in Latin and Greek, by Charles S. Halsey, Principal of the Union Classical Institute, Schenectady, N. Y.

In Greek the following peculiarity is found: Certain prepositions, when used in composition, and also certain inseparable prefixes, have in one combination a meaning directly opposite to that which they have in another combination. More precisely, it may be said that the same prefix is found to be negative in one case and intensive in another. It is to be regretted that this feature has not been specially noted or explained in the lexicons or grammars, for, whether from a theoretical or practical point of view, it has great interest and consequence. The object of the present paper is to enumerate the forms which show opposite meanings, and to propose a solution for the problem of their apparent contradiction.

These prepositions and prefixes are, in Latin, *ab*, *de*, *ex*, *per*, *pro*, *dis-*, *re-*, *vē-*; in Greek, *ἀπό*, *διά*, *ἐξ*.

The following examples will illustrate for the Latin: —

Ab. Negative: *similis*, like, *absimilis*, not like, unlike; *norma*, a rule, *abnormis*, without rule, abnormal; *jungo*, to yoke, to join, *abjungo*, to unyoke, to separate. Intensive: *utor*, to use, *abutor*, to use completely or to the end, to use thoroughly.

De. Negative: *dĕcet*, it is becoming or proper, *dedĕcet*, it is unbecoming or improper; *habeo*, to have, *dehabeo*, not to have, to lack; *mens*, mind, *demens*, out of one's mind or senses; *disco*, to learn, *dedisco*, to unlearn. Intensive: *fātigo*, to weary, *defātigo*, to weary completely; *labōro*, to work, *delabōro*, to work hard, to overwork; *ămo*, to love, *deămo*, to be desperately in love with, to love dearly.

Ex. Negative: *norma*, a rule, *enormis*, out of rule, irregular, enormous; *onĕro*, to load, *exonĕro*, to unload; *lingua*, the tongue, *elinguis*, without the tongue. Intensive: *dūrus*, hard, *edūrus*, very hard; *fĕrus*, wild, fierce, *effĕrus*, very wild, excessively wild; *disco*, to learn, *edisco*, to learn thoroughly or completely, to learn by heart.

Per. Negative: *fĭdes*, faith, *perfĭdus*, faithless. Intensive: *disco*, to learn, *perdisco*, to learn thoroughly or completely.

Pro. Negative: *festus*, of or belonging to holidays, festal, *profestus*, not kept as a holiday, non-festal. Intensive: *gnārus*, skilful, *prognāriter*, very skilfully; *lugeo*, to mourn, *prolugeo*, to mourn greatly.

Dis-. Negative: *cingo*, to gird, *discingo*, to ungird; *similis*, like, *dissimilis*, unlike; *facilis*, easy, *difficilis*, difficult. Intensive: *pereo*, to be lost, to go to ruin, *dispereo*, to go completely to ruin.

Re-. Negative: *tĕgo*, to cover, *retĕgo*, to uncover; *arguo*, to prove, *redarguo*, to disprove; *prŏbo*, to approve, *reprŏbo*, to disapprove. Intensive: *clāmo*, to cry

Digitized by Google

out, *reclāmo*, to cry out loudly against; *undo*, to rise in waves or surges, *redundo*, to overflow, to flow forth in excess.

Ve-. Negative: *sānus*, sound in body, sound in mind, *vesānus*, not of sound mind, insane; *grandis*, large, *vegrandis*, not very large, small; *cor*, the heart, mind, *vecors*, destitute of reason, senseless. Intensive: *pallidus*, pale, *vepallidus*, very pale.

Examples in Greek:

Ἀπό. Negative: καλύπτω, to cover, ἀποκαλύπτω, to uncover; αὐδάω, to speak, to say, ἀπαυδάω, (to say "no" =) to refuse, (not to say =) to become speechless; τιμή, honor, ἀπότιμος, put away from honor, dishonored. Intensive: δακρύω, to weep, ἀποδακρύω, to weep much.

Διά. Negative: ζεύγνυμι, to join, διαζεύγνῦμαι, to be disjoined. Intensive: πονέω, to work, to toil, διαπονέω, to work hard or thoroughly, to toil constantly; γαληνίζω, to calm, to still, διαγαληνίζω, to make quite calm.

Ἐξ. Negative: θῦμός, soul, spirit, mind, ἔκθῦμος, out of one's mind, senseless; δίκη, right, law, ἔκδικος, without law, lawless. Intensive: πέρθω, to waste, to destroy, ἐκπέρθω, to destroy utterly; ὁπλίζω, to make or get ready, to arm, ἐξοπλίζω, to arm completely.

For nearly all these cases of apparent contradiction one explanation may be given: most of these prefixes denote, either originally or by natural and easy transfer, the idea of separation. Separation, of course, can vary in degree, and when taken in the highest degree, or completely, it is equivalent to negation. For example, the thing most widely separated from the quality "good" is the absolute negation of good. Thus we may naturally account for the first or negative meaning.

To account for the second or intensive meaning we must observe that the mind naturally seeks a simple form of expression. When in language a term conveys a double or complex meaning there are really two meanings, and according as inclination or practical need may demand the mind drops one meaning and retains the other. Now, when as above stated the idea of separation in the highest degree or completely is in the mind there are really two ideas, one that of separation, the other that of degree, expressed by "completely." Sometimes one of these ideas may become altogether the more prominent, and the other may even disappear, the single rather than the complex idea being more natural or more desirable. Whenever the idea of separation has thus disappeared, there remains only the intensive meaning, expressed by "completely," "exceedingly," "very."

Illustrations of this principle may be found in our own language. From the word *out* we have the comparative *outer* or *utter* and a derivative adverb *utterly*. *Out* commonly implies separation. But the derivative *utterly* conveys no idea of separation; it has only the intensive force. Thus, *utterly vain* means completely vain. So the expression *out-and-out* denotes the same as *completely*.

In any case to which the preceding explanation does not clearly apply we may adopt the following: The idea of intensity is naturally developed from that of extent in space or time, of motion or the force that produces motion. For example, extent or motion throughout an object (compare the English *through*, *thorough*), from beginning to end, from bottom to top, from top to bottom, and also motion repeated. Motion or force in an opposite direction is naturally

Digitized by Google

associated with the idea of negation. The general explanation above given can be applied still more widely and in various languages.

11. On the Term "Contamination" used in reference to the Latin Comedy, by Professor Frederic D. Allen, of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

The modern use of this word as a technical term referring to the structure of Plautine or Terentian plays is based wholly upon two passages in the prologs of Terence, Andria 16 and Haut. 17. The current theory about the meaning of *contaminare* in these passages was set on foot by Grauert in 1833, in a treatise "über das Contaminiren," etc. In order to explain the words *multas contaminasse Graecas dum facit paucas Latinas* (Haut. prol. 17), Grauert felt obliged to assume an unusual meaning of *contaminare*, — namely, 'stick together,' 'weld together,' a meaning which he supposed to be the original one. This view has passed into our dictionaries, and is generally held. It is, however, beset with the serious difficulty that there is no further trace in all Latin literature of such a use of *contamino*. Everywhere else it means simply 'defile,' 'pollute,' by unclean touch. This meaning can be maintained in the Terentian prologs if we understand the word to refer to the Greek originals, and not to the Latin plays. "Terence" — so ran the charge of his rival — "spoiled a dozen Greek plays in making six Latin ones." A Greek play out of which a single scene had been taken was 'spoiled' for subsequent use; Luscius and his compeers could no longer do it into Latin. This 'spoiling' Luscius characterizes by a drastic metaphor: the plays in question were 'soiled'; they had been handled by Terence and bore the marks of his fingers. The opposite of a *fabula contaminata* was a *fabula integra*, a fresh, untranslated Greek play (Haut. prol. 4); and the opposite of *contaminare* was *integram relinquere* (Adelph. prol. 10).

12. The Tripods of Hephaestus, by Professor Thomas D. Seymour, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Thetis, on going to the home of Hephaestus in order to beg him to make a suit of armor for her son Achilles, finds the god making tripods:

> ἱδρώοντα, ἑλισσόμενον περὶ φύσας,
> σπεύδοντα· τρίποδας γὰρ ἐείκοσι πάντας ἔτευχεν
> ἑστάμεναι περὶ τοῖχον ἐυσταθέος μεγάροιο·
> χρύσεα δέ σφ' ὑπὸ κύκλα ἑκάστῳ πυθμένι θῆκεν,
> ὄφρα οἱ αὐτόματοι θέιον δυσαίατ' ἀγῶνα
> ἠδ' αὖτις πρὸς δῶμα νεοίατο, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι. — Hom. Σ 372–377.

What were these tripods? A tripod may be a three-foot measure, a three-legged animal, a three-legged kettle, a three-legged stand to place over the fire (a trivet), or a table ("in late Greek"), according to our lexicons. Our Homeric dictionaries do not give us much satisfaction with regard to this passage. Ebeling's Lexicon Homericum says: "*tripus, cortina*. . . . Artificiosum tripodum

Digitized by Google

genus Vulcanus pro supellectile fabricabatur." Seiler-Capelle and Autenrieth also intimate that the tripods in the passage before us were designed simply as ornaments for the room or as wine-mixers. But the gods did not need twenty κρητῆρες, — nowhere else called τρίποδες. And if the tripods were simply for decoration, what was their shape? Were they *kettles*, and kettles on castors? Who ever saw kettles on wheels? The kettle was not so familiar to the Homeric Greek as to us. Plato calls attention to the fact that the old heroes did not take the trouble to carry kettles with them on their expeditions, but always roasted their meat. They boiled no vegetables in camp. The Homeric kettle seems to have been used solely in heating water for the bath. From this use, the tripod was not likely to be developed at once into an ornamental object of which the gods would want a score.

Commentators on Homer have overlooked a passage in Xenophon's Anabasis, vii. 3. 21. In Thrace, at the court of Seuthes, the old customs are retained: The guests sit around in a circle; tables are brought in for them, — tables which are once called τρίποδες and then τράπεζαι. Blümner has lately called attention to three-legged tables on works of art in connection with a passage in Athenaeus, 49 A f.

An examination of Homeric customs and of the use of τρίπους in the sense of table makes probable the view that Hephaestus, at the moment in question, was busily engaged in constructing small tables or stands which could be used in the hall of the gods at great feasts, — borrowed for the occasion, as a lady of to-day may borrow teaspoons or hire chairs.

Remarks were made by Professor F. D. Allen and Dr. Morgan, and in reply by Professor Seymour.

13. Date of the Episode of Cylon in Athenian History,[1] by Professor John H. Wright, of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

The writer aimed to show that the date of the attempt of Cylon to make himself tyrant of Athens was nearer 640 B.C., when Cylon had won a victory in the δίαυλος at Olympia, than 612 B.C., the usually accepted date; in any case that it preceded the archonship of Draco. His arguments were drawn from the language of Herodotus (v. 71), Thucydides (i. 126), and the other sources; from considerations of the probable age at the time of the movement of Megacles, named in some of the authorities as prominent in the suppression of the movement, and from the date of Cylon's father-in-law, Theagenes, tyrant of Megara. It was claimed that the adoption of the earlier date lent unexpected coherence and significance to certain phenomena in early Athenian history, the episode thus being one of the important steps in the social and political development of Athens, and not an unrelated event.

On motion, the Chair appointed as a Committee to recommend time and place for the next Annual Meeting, Messrs. J. H. Hewitt, C. S. Halsey, S. Hart, and C. F. P. Bancroft.

[1] *Harvard Classical Studies*, Vol. I.

Digitized by Google

At 5.50 P. M. the Association adjourned, and in the evening many members and their friends attended the reception given at the Chapter-house of the Psi Upsilon Fraternity, by Mr. and Mrs. Elwell.

AMHERST, MASS., Thursday, July 12, 1888.

MORNING SESSION.

Professor Seymour, Vice-President, called the Association to order at 9.30 A. M.

14. A New Word: *Arbútus*, by Professor Fisk P. Brewer, of Grinnell, Iowa.

The Ar'butus. — Besides the Latin word arbutus (ar'bootoos), there is also an English word arbutus (arb'-yoo-tuss), which has the same meaning. It is the name of a shrub which grows ten or twelv feet high, has evergreen foliage, and bears scarlet berries. It is also called the ar'bute or strawberry-tree, and is known to botanists as the *Arbutus unedo.* It is cultivated as a garden ornament in England, and has been almost naturalized in Ireland. Its primitiv home is on the north shores of the Mediterranean. The Latin poets Vergil and Horace speak of it, the latter as a shelter under which to stretch the limbs, *viridi membra sub arbuto Stratus.* The present writer remembers seeing it in Attica, and picking its berries while riding by on horseback. It is found also on the mountains north of Palestine, according to the letter of Dr. Geo. E. Post in the *New York Evangelist* of May 18, 1888. The plant is not found at all in America, and is rarely spoken of here except as one meets the name in reading Latin writers or descriptions of foren lands. It has but little prominence in literature. It is accented in American scools and by American scolars just as by the English. And yet, curiously enuf, our two great American dictionaries, Worcester in 1860 and Webster in 1864, while giving the uzual definition of the word, accent it on the second syllable.

The New Word. — This identical mistake made by two eminent lexicografers was due to the influence of an unobserved growth in the language, a word not clearly recognized, a sort of undiscovered planet in the lexical system. The Trailing Arbútus, a very different plant from the European árbutus, receives subordinate notice by Worcester under the word Trailing and by Webster under Mayflower. Neither dictionary marks its peculiar accent. The plant the *Epigæa repens* is found only in America. Here only is its name herd in colloquial use, and to this continent its history belongs. It is an erly flower, with blossoms of pinkish white that sumtimes open in the neighborhood of yet unmelted snows.

According to tradition, it was the first flower that greeted the Pilgrims at Plymouth in 1621 after their first fearful winter. Whittier commemorates that welcum by "The first sweet smiles of May," and tels how

Digitized by Google

"the blossoms peer
Above the brown leaves, dry and dead."

"Oh! sacred flowers of faith and hope,
As sweetly now as then,
Ye bloom on many a birchen slope,
In many a pine-dark glen."

Botanical History. — The plant was figured in Plukenet's Almagestum in 1696 (as Prof. D. C. Eaton of Yale College informs me). It was named as *Pyrolæ affinis*, related to the Pyrola. Gronovius in Flora Virgin. (1739) describes it in Latin as an *arbutus*, altho *planta est humillima nunquam a terra assurgens.* In calling it an árbutus he is not confounding one plant with another, but simply recognizing a structural resemblance which is not visible to an unscientific eye. Linnaeus gave it its generic name of *Epigæa* in 1751.

In 1806, Shecut in his Flora Carolin. speaks of it as Trailing Arbutus. Other botanists followed his example, as Amos Eaton, 1817; Deweg, 1829; Wood, 1846. None of these mark the accent. No dout Shecut or the botanist, whoever it was, that first coind the compound name called it, and ment to hav it called, trailing árbutus. This is not a matter of testimony, but of conjecture. At the present time, however, the pronunciation arbútus prevails among the common people from Maine to Carolina. No other uzage is known, except among a few purists in these later years, and no other is recalled by witnesses whose memory goes back more than fifty years.

A Conjecture. — When was the accent alterd, and by whom? In the absence of records, I offer the following conjecture: Before the name of trailing arbutus became a part of the spoken language it was uzed for a while merely as a book-word, copied from one author by another. Then the persons who first tried to pronounce it from books, not being familiar with the European árbutus, and knowing no other English word of like ending, were influenced by memories of the Latin Grammar to accent the novel name like the participles *acutus, minutus, solutus, tributus.*

In American Literature. — In recent American literature the trailing arbutus is often mentioned as a sweet harbinger of spring. The poets usually employ the simple form arbutus, and show by their verse that they hav the same accent as the common people. All the examples I hav ar of very recent years. In Longfellow I do not find the word, but he has arbute in this sense with the accent on the second syllable. In his lines "To a Child," 1846, he tels how an Indian peasant made a discovery of silver, when he,

"In falling, clutched the frail arbute,
The fibres of whose shallow root,
Uplifted from the soil, betrayed
The silver veins beneath it laid."

The first line of this passage is cited in Murray's Dictionary, but erroneously, as an example of árbute.

Conclusion. — The evidence, then, proves that arbútus or trailing arbútus is

Digitized by Google

the name of our American herald of spring. Its accent has the authority of general uzage. There is no higher authority for the accent of the original Latin word itself. The two words differ from each other in sound no more than the pair *min*ute and m*inute*. The temporary confusion into which the dictionaries hav falln wil be relievd by inserting in them such a section as this:

AR-BU'-TUS, *n.* The name of an American wild-flower, the *Epigæa repens*, prized as a harbinger of spring; called also trailing arbutus and Mayflower.

P.S. — There is evidence that the accent arbútus prevails in England also in speaking of the strawberry-tree. A correspondent from Street, Somerset, encloses, Jan. 10, 1889, a fresh-pickt specimen with flower and ripe fruit on the same spray, and writes: "The Ar*bu*tus is common here. No one that I enquire of has heard the pronunciation *ar*butus by any one of any account."

Remarks were made upon the subject by Professors T. D. Seymour, F. D. Allen, and B. Perrin, and Messrs. W. I. Fletcher and M. H. Morgan.

15. Impersonal Verbs, by Julius Goebel, Ph. D., late of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

The question concerning the origin and nature of the so-called impersonals interests alike the philosopher and the philologian: these expressions seem to present an exception to the law of logic, which requires each judgment to consist of two members, and to the syntactical rule that each sentence should consist of subject and predicate. The writer discussed the several theories upon the subject: (1) that of the defenders of the notion that a subject is contained in the impersonals (Ueberweg, Lotze, Prantl, Bergmann, and Wundt); (2) that of those who hold that there is no subject contained in the impersonals, some of whom go so far as to require a revision of the laws of logic concerning the nature of a judgment (Herbart, Trendelenburg, Miklosich, Marty, Heyse, Grimm, Benfey); (3) that of Paul and others, who hold an intermediate position, making a distinction between the psychological and the logical subjects of a sentence. The writer aimed to supplement Sigwart's discussion, made from the point of view of logic, by considerations drawn from linguistics, and maintained that all impersonal constructions involve the same subject which meets all cases, though not expressed. Many illustrations, drawn especially from the German, were presented.

16. The Authorship of Lucian's Cynicus, by Josiah Bridge, Ph. D., of Cambridge, Mass.

The aim of this paper was to show, first, that Fritzsche's statement[1] that the same man could not have written the Fugitivi and the Cynicus is incorrect; secondly, that Lucian did write the Cynicus.

[1] Edit. II. 2, p. 235.

Digitized by Google

True Cynicism was to Lucian the highest type of Philosophy (v. the Demonax, and cf. Trajectus 7 with Fug. 5). The mass of Cynics of Lucian's day were to him false Cynics. The same man could attack these, as in the Fugitivi, and defend Cynicism, as in the Cynicus. As far as concerns the argument, Lucian might have written the Cynicus.

But the language of the Cynicus is not Lucian's. Du Soul contends that almost the opening words, *κόμην ἔχειν*, could not have been written by Lucian, since Cynics in his day were *ἐν χρῷ κεκαρμένοι*. But in every passage where Cynics' hair is expressly mentioned the hair is long. The one exception (Fug. 27) is only an apparent exception; there Cantharus, a Cynic, is spoken of as *ἐν χρῷ κουρίαν*. But Cantharus in Thrace is said to have turned Stoic (Fug. 31), and Stoics unquestionably were *ἐν χρῷ κεκαρμένοι* (Hermot. 18, Bis acc. 20).

A striking variance from Lucian's style is the frequent repetition of the first word in a clause (cf. cc. 5, 8, 16), leading to the inference that if Lucian really wrote the Cynicus he was imitating some one in this. Dio Chrysostom bears marked resemblance to our Cynic, both in manner of life and in style, to such an extent that some of the Cynic's expressions may easily have been based on passages in Dio's orations (cf. especially Or. 72 with the Cynicus). It was maintained that Lucian wrote the Cynicus to show that what he had hitherto been attacking in the Cynics was not their dress nor their life of self-denial; and that here as elsewhere *σπουδογέλοιος* he uses the famous Dio for his mouthpiece.

Remarks were made by Professors F. D. Allen and J. H. Wright.

Professor Francis A. March, as Chairman of the Committee on the Reform of English Spelling, reported that no action had been taken by the Committee since the last report. There has been some correspondence in regard to the publication of a manual dictionary using the amended spellings.

The report was accepted, and the Committee appointed in 1875 was continued for another year. It now consists of Messrs. March (chairman), W. F. Allen, Child, Lounsbury, Price, Trumbull, and Whitney.

The report of the Committee to nominate Officers was presented, and adopted. In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee the following gentlemen were elected officers of the Association for 1888–89: —

President, Professor Thomas D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Vice-Presidents, Professor Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., and Professor Bernadotte Perrin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
Secretary, Professor John H. Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Treasurer, Professor John H. Wright.

Digitized by Google

Additional members of the *Executive Committee*,—

Professor Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Professor Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Dr. Julius Sachs, New York, N. Y.
Professor William D. Whitney, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The Committee appointed to propose time and place for the next meeting recommended that the Twenty-first Annual Session be held on the second Tuesday of July, 1889, either at Norwich, Conn., or at Easton, Pa., as might be hereafter determined by the Executive Committee.

The report was accepted and adopted.

The report of the Committee to audit the Treasurer's accounts was presented, to the effect that the accounts had been examined and found correct.

On motion of Professor W. C. Poland, a resolution was adopted as follows: —

The American Philological Association desires to express its hearty thanks to the President and Faculty of Amherst College, for the use of the halls of the College for the meetings of the Association, and for the invitation to visit the buildings of the College; to Mr. and Mrs. L. H. Elwell for the kind reception given to the members in the chapter-house of the Psi Upsilon Society; and to Professor W. L. Montague and his associate teachers for the invitation to attend the lectures and other exercises of the Summer School of Languages.

A letter was read from Professor Fisk B. Brewer, of Grinnell, Iowa, in which the suggestion was made that the members of the Association should prepare lists of new words, or of old words with new meanings, in use in various parts of the United States.

The proposition was discussed by Professors F. A. March, F. D. Allen, I. H. Hall, and Dr. M. H. Morgan. It was then referred to the Executive Committee.

17. Lex Curiata de Imperio, by Professor W. F. Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; read by Professor J. M. Paton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.

Mommsen, in his *Römisches Staatsrecht* (i. 50), takes the ground that the *lex curiata de imperio* did not confer a grant of power, but was of the nature of an obligatory act, binding the citizens to the recognition of an authority already

Digitized by Google

possessed by the magistrate. This view he supports both on general grounds, because it is not conceivable that the State should ever be left without some person competent to command its armies, and by the evidence of individual cases. As regards the first consideration, it is certain that the safety of the State would outweigh all technical limitations of power; and that some practical method would be found to meet the emergency, just as in the case of a provincial army suddenly left without a commander, or the special authority vested in the consuls by the Senate, through the formula *videant consules*, etc. It may be doubted, however, whether this irregular exercise of the *imperium* was ever extended to the act of holding the *comitia centuriata*, which was an essential part of the constitutional machinery.

The only examples of importance adduced by Mommsen, are three in number. First, the consul Flaminius, B.C. 217, who entered upon his office at Ariminum, and of course could not have carried this law in person. Mommsen had himself held previously that the law could have been carried for him by his colleague, and this seems the most reasonable explanation of the case. Secondly, the consuls of B.C. 49, who found themselves at Thessalonica at the close of the year, with all the machinery of government, but without the formal possession of the *imperium*, which they had neglected to procure; they therefore were unable to have new consuls elected, but continued to exercise command, as proconsuls. This, of course, was no more irregular than their exercise of consular command the year before; but it seems to prove that the consular *comitia* could not be held without the formal possession of the *imperium*. The third case is that of Appius Claudius, consul B.C. 54, who declared that he would go to his province, although he had not procured this law — that the law was *opus*, but was not *necesse*. Mommsen takes this declaration of Claudius as a correct expression of law: it seems to me rather to be a technical quibble devised to give color to an illegal act.

To pass from theoretical considerations and particular instances, to legal statements: we have the strongest and most positive assertions of Livy (v. 52. 15), Cicero (leg. agr. ii. 11 and 12), and Dio Cassius (39. 19), to the effect that the military authority could not be legally exercised without the passage of this law. It is also explicitly stated (leg. agr. ii. 11. 26) that the object of the law was to enable the people to pass a second judgment upon the magistrates whom they had elected, from which it follows that without it their power would be incomplete.

18. On the Identity of Words and the misapplication of the term "Cognate" to words that are identical, by Professor Lemuel S. Potwin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.; read by Professor T. D. Seymour.

Philology has much to do with the parentage and relationship of words. But this involves the question of identity. I open Skeat's Dictionary at the word "man." Of the eight words, under this, marked as "cognate," four appear to be the same word — "man." Shall the same sound, with the same meaning, be called a different word because uttered and written by a Swede or a Hollander, instead of an Englishman? If not, shall we allow such variety in identity as to include all the eight "cognates," and say that the English *man*, the Latin *mās*, the Gothic *manna*, and the Sanskrit *manu* are one word?

Digitized by Google

In the strictest sense, every spoken word perishes in the utterance, and no two are the same. But common sense recognizes repeated and transmitted words as identical. The identity of words is like that of coins. You may identify a particular coin in order to determine ownership, but there is a broader identity that covers all the issues of one denomination. So you may identify a particular word, spoken at a certain time, in order to fix responsibility; but there is a broader identity that comprehends all the repetitions of a word, with all their variations, from its first utterance to the end of speech.

What are the tests of this identity of words? Of course, all special tests are subject to the general principles that establish the division of languages into families; and the following remarks have particular reference to the Indo-European family. Subject to this condition, then, it should seem that the most complete proof of identity would be *sameness both of sound and meaning*, — it being understood that the history of the word endorses the sameness of meaning. But this principle is violated in every Dictionary that gives lists of "cognate" words from foreign languages. Are words that are identical in form and meaning to be pronounced kindred, simply because they are spoken in different countries? If so, why not words of different generations in the same country? Are the similar words of various nations *analogues* merely, like their flora and fauna? Unless we abandon the idea of the historical unity of language-families, we must believe that these so-called cognates are *transmitted* by voluntary imitation, whatever lines of race or language they may cross. So long as they are plainly recognizable as the same in sound and meaning, their identity, in the ear of philology, ought not to be disputed.

(2) A second point in regard to tests of identity is that considerable variation in *sound*, or form, is compatible with identity. Illustrations: (*a*) Varieties of pronunciation in the same people at the same time, arising from differences of ear, vocal power, age, cultivation, etc. The word is identified whenever it is sufficiently expressed to be understood.

(*b*) Borrowed words more or less changed in passing into a new language. If the Latin *aër* is the same word as the Greek ἀήρ, why is not the English *air* the same also? Words in the same language change greatly without losing their identity. So may borrowed words. If *surgeon* is the same words as *chirurgeon*, why is not *voyage* the same as *viaticum?* (*c*) Words not borrowed, unless it be in prehistoric times, but whose form and meaning indicate transmission from a single source. Here belong all those words whose variations are recognized by Grimm's Law.

(3) A third point is that considerable variation in *meaning* is compatible with identity. The Oxford Dictionary gives sixteen meanings of the word "board." Webster gives twenty-one to "line." No one questions the identity of these words. Nor is it possible to lay down perfectly definite rules for the development of meaning. Since the days of *lucus a non lucendo*, there has been great progress towards settled principles, but no rules can hedge the path of mental association closely enough to touch its every word.

It will be seen that these principles leave ample room for the modification that a word may suffer from belonging to different nations and languages. It need not lose its identity in the mouth of new or strange speakers. We cannot admit,

Digitized by Google

therefore, as an additional test, that identical words must belong to the same language.

Identity and derivation are mutually exclusive. If a word is derived from another, it is not the same as that other. Derivation creates new words. Identity declares that a word is not new. What is a new word? and how can derivation be distinguished from inflection? Is *amator* a distinct word from *amare*, but *amas*, *amaverunt* and the rest all one with *amare?* The legitimacy of a derived word is established by its equality with acknowledged pre-existing words. *Amator* is a new noun, if it can be shown to have all the rights and privileges of the old stock of accepted nouns. And this is shown by its *possession of inflections.* *Amator* becomes a source of relational forms; *amas* does not, but simply remains itself one of these forms. Identity has no quarrel with derivation in its business of creating new words. It does not claim that all words having a common root are identical. It follows the new-created words through all their change of sound and meaning, through all their periods of time, and their places of utterances, and marks them as the same.

Further, derivation takes effect within the limits of a single language. It may be accomplished by formatives that are borrowed, as well as native, but the process itself is native. There are no formatives that merely make words the members of another language. Derivation belongs to the home-department of a language, but identity is both an internal and inter-lingual fact. This domestic character of derivation lends an inference for prehistoric language that bears upon the question of identity. Skeat's Dictionary, under the word "foot," gives nine cognate words, in as many languages, and all are said to be derived from the root *pad*, to go. No doubt they are so derived, ultimately, but not separately. It seems probable that the derivation took place in the parent language, or in some other single language, and that the new word was transmitted, with variations, throughout the whole family.

This question of identity brings up the distinction between "roots" and "words." In much of the language used about roots, it seems to be implied that a root is a sort of latent material for words, with no independent life of its own. When we claim identity for the words of different languages, we are met by "Oh, yes, they have the same *root*, but the *words* are different." A root is originally a word. Else it would never be the root of anything. A word descends to the place of a *mere root* when it has lost its independence through derivation, including composition. Thus, though *stare* is the same word as *stand*, it is a root only of the word *constitution.* Unless we are prepared to maintain that the least variety in pronunciation or inflection, in the transmission of words, destroys their identity, then the Greek *ποδ* and the Latin *ped* are the same word; — not the same to a proof-reader, but the same to a philologist. If they are not, then the Old English *cu*, and the Yankee *căow*, and the proper *cow* are not the same word. They are but cognate, and have the same root.

The foregoing discussion ought to give some light on the proper use of the term "cognate" or "kindred." Its application to identical words in different languages arose, probably, from its use in designating peoples and nations. These are kindred by birth. Languages, too, may be called kindred, if they are of common origin, as shown by their structure, whether spoken by kindred or

Digitized by Google

not. It is very natural to call identical words "kindred" merely because they are spoken by kindred peoples, but the usage is without foundation in reason. As well say that the coins that pass current among kindred nations are themselves cognate.

There is, however, a legitimate use of the term as applied to words *derived*, instead of words *transmitted*. Thus all the numerous words derived from the root *sta* are cognate, but not the various forms representing the root itself. These are identical. These are the parent; the cognates are the offspring; and one may, if he can, mark the different degrees of relationship with the accuracy of the old Roman law, by counting the steps up to, and down from, the common ancestor.

Remarks were made upon the paper by Professor F. A. March and Dr. George M. Richardson.

The following papers, in the absence of the writers, were read by title: —

19. The Locality of the Saltus Teutoburgiensis, by Professor W. F. Allen, of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

The locality of the *Saltus Teutoburgiensis*, in which the Roman army under Varus sustained a crushing defeat, A.D. 9, has been recently discussed by Mommsen (*Die Oertlichkeit der Varusschlacht*, 1885) and Knoke (*Die Kriegszüge des Germanicus*, 1887). Mommsen places it at Barenau, north of Osnaburg, chiefly on the ground of a large number of coins found in that neighborhood; Knoke places it, for strategic reasons, at Iburg, south of Osnaburg. The old theory, that it was at Detmold, where a monument has been erected in honor of Arminius, has now been generally abandoned, and will be presently shown to be impossible. Another view, especially advocated by Essellen (*Das Varianische Schlachtfeld im Kreise Beckum*, 1874), places it in the forest of Havixbrock, in the district of Beckum, near Hamm.

A clear idea of the country, at some point within which the battle took place, is necessary to the discussion of the question. This is the country between the Weser and Rhine, two rivers which at this point run nearly parallel, about a hundred English miles apart. About half way between the two rivers, and parallel with them, runs the Ems, a much shorter stream; and south of the Ems, and nearly at right angles with the other rivers, flows the Lippe, rising in the Osning range of mountains near the Weser, and emptying into the Rhine near Düsseldorf. The valley of this river affords a direct route to the valley of the Weser, through the pass in the Osning at Detmold. This valley served, therefore, as the natural line of communication between the Roman base of operations upon the Rhine and the posts upon the Weser: the principal station of Lower Germany, *Castra vetera*, was opposite the mouth of the Lippe, while the principal Roman fortress in Germany, Aliso, was upon this river, probably at the confluence of the Ahse, near Hamm. *Ad caput Lupiae fluminis* (Vell. Pat. ii. 105) Tiberius had his winter quarters, A.D. 4. A military road was laid out up

Digitized by Google

the valley of the Lippe, crossing the Osning range at Detmold, into the valley of the Weser.

The valley of the Lippe was regularly employed by Drusus and the other earlier commanders for the purpose of their military campaigns. Germanicus, however, in his campaigns of 15 and 16, chose another route, by which he could have the advantage of water transportation; making his way from the Rhine through the aestuaries and lagoons of the Low Countries to the Ems, and thus making the Ems his basis of operations. In the campaign of 15 he followed the Ems up to the country of the Bructeri, near Münster, and from this point visited the battle-ground of Varus (Tac. Ann. i. 60). The following year he crossed from the Ems to the Weser at a point lower down; and in this campaign, although he must have passed very near Barenau, he makes no mention of the battle-field, — a strong argument against Mommsen's view.

The fact that, when on the upper Ems, he was near (*haud procul*) the battle-field, appears to exclude Barenau, and certainly excludes Detmold, but lends itself easily to either Iburg or Beckum. The circumstances of his visit to the locality the next year (Tac. Ann. ii. 7) point decisively to Beckum. Hearing that a fort (no doubt Aliso) upon the Lippe was besieged by the Germans, he marched against them from the Rhine with six legions. The enemy slipped away at his approach, but first threw down the mound which he had built the year before in memory of the legions of Varus, as well as the altar to Drusus: *neque Caesari copiam pugnae opsessores fecere, ad famam adventus eius dilapsi: tumulum tamen nuper Varianis legionibus structum et veterem aram Druso sitam disiecerant.* The pluperfect *disiecerant* shows that they did this before their retreat, and that the altar and the mound were near the fort upon the Lippe. From this it follows with certainty that the Teutoburg Forest was near the Lippe: a conclusion with which the locality of Iburg, as well as of Barenau, is inconsistent, while Detmold is excluded by the proximity to the Ems.

These strategic reasons are all that deserve consideration in the study of the question. The description of the ground given by Dio Cassius (56, 20) is vague at best, and would probably apply to fifty places within the region in question. All ancient historians are deficient in the capacity — an exceedingly rare one — of describing accurately and intelligibly the physical features of a battle-field or any similar ground. Dio speaks, it is true, of mountains and ravines (*ὄρη καὶ φαρᾳγγώδη καὶ ἀνώμαλα*); and the country about Beckum is not mountainous, but consists of a succession of hills and gullies, well suited to an ambuscade. The only contemporary writer who speaks of the affair, Velleius Paterculus (ii. 119), makes no mention of mountains or even hills: his words are *inclusus silvis paludibus insidiis.*

20. Observations on the Fourth Eclogue of Vergil, by Professor W. S. Scarborough, of Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.

This Eclogue, unlike the remaining nine, has little in common with the pastorals of Theocritus, except, perhaps, casual references to a few rural scenes. In this respect Vergil has departed from his master and has adopted a style peculiarly his own, which in some respects transcends bucolic limits.

Digitized by Google

For glow of imagery and exaggerated effusion it stands alone. Between the human and the divine, there is more of the latter than of the former. It is a remarkable production, abounding in passages of striking resemblance to many of the old Messianic prophecies. There is just enough of the maze about it to confuse the reader and make it doubtful on his part as to the poet's real design.

The date of this poem is said to be about 40 B.C., during the consulship of Asinius Pollio, a friend of the poet. To him also he was indebted for the restoration of his property, previously confiscated by an order of Augustus. In view of this circumstance many critics have supposed that Vergil testifies his gratitude to Pollio by dedicating these lines to his unborn son, and that v. 17,

Pacatumque reget patriis virtutibus orbem,

confirms the theory.

The writer took exception to this view, asserting there is nothing in the line to support it, as the subject of *reget* is not expressed and is likewise indefinite; that the prediction was not fulfilled, as the son of Pollio died in infancy; and if he had lived, it could not have been fulfilled, as the description, taking the Eclogue as a whole, was not only inapplicable to "the consular dignity of Pollio," but to mortals generally. It was true that the golden age was earnestly looked for, and that the theme of the poet was the *age of peace*, and as a result exaggerated descriptions and highly colored expressions followed as it were from necessity. As proof many passages from the poets were cited.

Many of the theories held by scholars were briefly discussed, and the view advanced by a *few* that Vergil wrote under inspiration was objected to. The writer held that Vergil probably had some knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures, as the Jews were quite widely spread over the Roman Empire about this time, and the Old Testament Scripture had become largely known to Gentile as well as Jew. There seems to have been a general belief that a Messiah would come into the world, and it is not unlikely that the poet may have shared this belief.

The ground of this statement was based mainly upon the resemblances existing between passages in the Eclogue and the language of the prophet Isaiah, especially the eleventh chapter of his prophecies. Other Scripture was also cited and compared with the more striking parts of the Eclogue (notably Gen. iii. 15; Eccl. iv. 24, etc.).

The writer held that neither *coincidences nor the images employed by Hesiod and the poets generally descriptive of the golden age* could be regarded as sufficient to explain these marvellous passages. There seems to be an intentional obscurity, which makes the meaning of the poet difficult to understand and renders a clear exposition impossible. If we accept in explanation Vergil's acquaintance with the Sibylline books of Alexandrian manufacture, then we must conclude that those books reflected Jewish ideas largely.

The writer also held the theory "*that reference is made to the expected offspring of Octavianus and Scribonia*" to be untenable; likewise, "*that the child referred to was the son of Antony and Octavia*" to be without support. In the first place, the child of Octavianus and Scribonia was the wicked and disreputable Julia; in the second place, it is highly improbable that Vergil would make the child of a subordinate person the redeemer of the Roman world. Then, too, Antony was

Digitized by Google

the rival of Augustus, and one whom Vergil would hardly have complimented in this way at the expense of his friend and patron.

If any compliment at all was intended in this poem, the writer suggested the preferable one among various views, the name of Marcellus, the son of Octavia by her former husband of the same name (Aen. vi. 861 sqq.). He was born during the consulship of Pollio, was adopted by Augustus, and was intended by him to be his successor. Vergil pays him a glowing tribute in the sixth book of the Aeneid.

Adjourned.

Digitized by Google

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1888–89.

PRESIDENT.

THOMAS D. SEYMOUR.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

CHARLES R. LANMAN.
BERNADOTTE PERRIN.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.

JOHN H. WRIGHT.

TREASURER.

JOHN H. WRIGHT.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The officers above named, and —

MARTIN L. D'OOGE.
BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.
FRANCIS A. MARCH.
JULIUS SACHS.
WILLIAM D. WHITNEY.

Digitized by Google

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.[1]

F. F. Abbott, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
J. W. Abernethy, Adelphi Academy, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Cyrus Adler, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Charles A. Aiken, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
Frederic D. Allen, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
George Gillespie Allen, Boston, Mass.
William F. Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Robert Andersen, Episcopal Academy, 1314 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Joseph Anderson, Waterbury, Conn.
Louis F. Anderson, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington Ter.
N. L. Andrews, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Robert Arrowsmith, Barnard School, St. Paul, Minn.
Sidney G. Ashmore, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
E. J. Badgley, Victoria College, Cobourg, Ont.
Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
E. H. Barlow, Tilden Seminary, West Lebanon, N. H.
Timothy J. Barrett, Boston College, Boston, Mass.
George A. Bartlett, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
William M. Baskerville, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Isbon T. Beckwith, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
A. J. Bell, Victoria College, Cobourg, Ont.
George Bendelari, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Charles E. Bennett, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. (511 North Sixteenth St.).
T. S. Bettens, "The Kensington," cor. Fifty-seventh St. and Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.
Louis Bevier, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
George H. Bingham, Pinkerton Academy, Derry, N. H.
E. C. Bissell, Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. (10 Garden St.).
James Black, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
James S. Blackwell, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

[1] This list has been corrected up to June 15, 1889; permanent addresses are given, as far as may be. Names where the residence is left blank are either of members who are in Europe, or of those whose addresses are not known to the Secretary.

Digitized by Google

Maurice Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
C. W. E. Body, Trinity College, Toronto, Ont.
James R. Boise, Baptist Theological Seminary, Morgan Park, Ill.
Algernon Boys, Trinity College, Toronto, Ont.
Charles Frederic Bradley, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
H. C. G. Brandt, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
F. P. Brent, Onancock, Va.
Fisk P. Brewer, Grinnell, Ia.
Josiah Bridge, New York, N. Y.
H. S. Bridges, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N. B.
Le Baron R. Briggs, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
John A. Broadus, Southern Baptist Theol. Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
Frank M. Bronson, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Jabez Brooks, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (1708 Laurel Ave.).
Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Walter H. Buell, Scranton, Pa. (243 Jefferson Ave.).
Sylvester Burnham, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Henry F. Burton, Univ. of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. (63 East Ave.).
Henry A. Buttz, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
William H. Carpenter, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Franklin Carter, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Charles F. Castle, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
Charles Chandler, Denison University, Granville, O.
Eva Channing, Forest Hill St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
A. C. Chapin, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
Elie Charlier (Life Member), 108 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
Francis J. Child, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Frank A. Christie, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Bradbury L. Cilley, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
Kate Holladay Claghorn, Brooklyn, N. Y. (5 Second Place).
Edward B. Clapp, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.
Henry Clarke, 18 Ladbroke Grove, Notting Hill, London W., England.
Herbert M. Clarke, St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y.
Henry A. Coit, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
W. C. Collar, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass.
Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
William T. Colville, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.
Richard S. Colwell, Denison University, Granville, O.
David Y. Comstock, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
Albert S. Cook, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Joseph Randolph Coolidge, Boston, Mass. (44 State St.).
Oscar H. Cooper, Austin, Tex.
George Cornish, McGill University, Montreal, P. Q.

Digitized by Google

William L. Cowles, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Edward G. Coy, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
T. F. Crane, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
W. Craven, Knox College, Toronto, Ont.
Howard Crosby, New York, N. Y. (116 East Nineteenth St.).
John M. Cross, Kingston, N. Y.
John M. Crow, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia.
W. S. Currell, Davidson College, N. C.
S. E. D. Currier, 2 Cedar St., Roxbury, Mass.
Samuel Ives Curtiss, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
William L. Cushing, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
Sanford L. Cutler, Lawrence Academy, Groton, Mass.
William Dale, University College, Toronto, Ont.
C. T. Davis, Packer Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Schele De Vere, University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.
Francis B. Denio, Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.
Martin L. D'Ooge, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Manuel J. Drennan, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Morton W. Easton, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
T. T. Eaton, Louisville, Ky.
William Wells Eaton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Thomas H. Eckfeldt, Friends' School, New Bedford, Mass.
August Hjalmar Edgren, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Howard Edwards, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
Arthur M. Elliott, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Herbert C. Elmer, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Joseph Emerson, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
Carl W. Ernst, *The Beacon*, Boston, Mass.
Arthur J. Evans, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
Arthur Fairbanks.
H. R. Fairclough, University College, Toronto, Ont.
Thomas Fell, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.
E. G. Ferguson, McKendree College, Lebanon, Ill.
O. M. Fernald, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Mrs. G. W. Field, 204 Columbia Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Isaac Flagg, Westville, Conn.
John Fletcher, Queen's College, Kingston, Ont.
O. O. Fletcher, Springfield, Ill. (206 Capitol Avenue).
Carlton A. Foote, New Haven, Conn.
John Forrest, Dalhousie College, Halifax, N. S.
Harold N. Fowler, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
William Gallagher, Williston Seminary, East Hampton, Mass.
Paul C. Gandolfo, St. Louis, Mo. (3102 Clark Ave.).

Digitized by Google

James M. Garnett, University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.
Henry Garst, Otterbein University, Westerville, O.
Albert S. Gatschet, United States Bureau of Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.
Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
F. B. Goddard, Malden, Mass. (Egyptian Exploration Fund.)
Julius Goebel, *Belletristisches Journal*, New York, N. Y. (Box 3595).
Horace Goodhue, Jr., Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
Abby M. Goodwin, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Richard J. H. Gottheil, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Thomas D. Goodell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
J. E. Goodrich, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
Ralph L. Goodrich, U. S. Courts, Little Rock, Ark.
William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
George M. Grant, Queen's College, Kingston, Ont.
James B. Greenough, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Lee L. Grumbine, Lebanon, Pa.
F. B. Gummere, Haverford College, Pa.
William Gardner Hale, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Arthur P. Hall, Drury College, Springfield Mo.
Isaac H. Hall, Metropolitan Museum, Central Park, New York, N. Y.
Randall C. Hall, General Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.
Charles S. Halsey, Union Classical Institute, Schenectady, N. Y.
William McD. Halsey, New York, N. Y. (34 West Fortieth St.).
Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
William R. Harper, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Carter J. Harris, Washington-Lee University, Lexington, Va.
J. Rendel Harris, Haverford College, Pa.
Caskie Harrison, Latin School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (185 Montague St.).
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Paul Haupt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Edward Southworth Hawes, Cathedral School of St. Paul, Garden City, N. Y.
Theophilus Heness, 142 Crown St., New Haven, Conn.
*Lucius Heritage, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
W. T. Hewett, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
John H. Hewitt, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Cambridge, Mass.
Hermann V. Hilprecht, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Newton B. Hobart, Western Reserve Academy, Hudson, O.
Horace A. Hoffman, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
Addison Hogue, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss.
Edward W. Hopkins, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

* Died May 14, 1889.

Digitized by Google

William Houston, Toronto, Can.
E. R. Humphreys, 129 West Chester Park, Boston, Mass.
Milton W. Humphreys, Hotel Westland, West Chester Park, Boston, Mass.
Theodore W. Hunt, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
W. I. Hunt, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
George B. Hussey, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
Edmund Morris Hyde, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa.
Andrew Ingraham, Swain Free School, New Bedford, Mass.
A. V. W. Jackson, Columbia College, New York, N. Y. (Highland Ave., Yonkers, N. Y.
Hans C. G. von Jagemann, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Morris Jastrow, Jr., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Henry Johnson, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Henry C. Johnson, Philadelphia, Pa.
John Johnson, Dalhousie College, Halifax, N. S.
Thomas M. Johnson, Editor of *The Platonist*, Osceola, Mo.
R. V. Jones, Acadia College, Wolfeville, N. S.
Thomas W. Jordan, Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va.
Robert P. Keep, Free Academy, Norwich, Conn.
Martin Kellogg, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Alexander Kerr, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
George Lyman Kittredge, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
William I. Knapp, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (75 Whitney Ave.).
William A. Lamberton, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Lewis H. Lapham, 68 Gold St., New York, N. Y.
C. W. Larned, U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.
William Cranston Lawton, Cambridge, Mass.
Abby Leach, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
M. D. Learned, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
J. T. Lees, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
R. F. Leighton, 312 Clermont Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
John M. Leonard, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
Thomas B. Lindsay, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
Gonzalez Lodge, Davidson College, N. C.
Charles Louis Loos, Kentucky University, Lexington, Ky.
Frances E. Lord, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
George D. Lord, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Jules Luquiens, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.
Frederick Lutz, Albion College, Albion, Mich.
Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Francis A. March, Jr., Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Samuel A. Martin, Lincoln University, Lincoln, Pa.

Digitized by Google

Winfred R. Martin.
Ellen F. Mason, Newport, R. I.
R. H. Mather, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
B. C. Mathews, Newark, N. J. (58 Lincoln Ave.).
Thomas McCabe, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
W. Gordon McCabe, University School, Petersburg, Va.
J. J. McCook, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Joseph H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
George F. McKibben, Denison University, Granville, O.
H. Z. McLain, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.
George McMillan, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Elmer T. Merrill, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
William A. Merrill, Miami University, Oxford, O.
Frank G. Moore, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
George F. Moore, Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
J. L. Moore, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Morris H. Morgan, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Edward P. Morris, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
John Robert Moses, Rugby Academy, Philadelphia, Pa. (3208 Race St.).
Wilfred H. Munro, Dedham, Mass.
Augustus T. Murray, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.
Francis Philip Nash, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
C. K. Nelson, Brookeville Academy, Brookeville, Md.
James King Newton, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.
Frank W. Nicolson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Marston Niles, 155 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Edward North, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
William A. Packard, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
F. V. N. Painter, Roanoke College, Salem, Va.
Arthur H. Palmer, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O. (750 Republic St.).
Charles P. Parker, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Henry E. Parker, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
William H. H. Parks, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
E. G. Parsons, Derry, N. H.
James C. Parsons, Prospect Hill School, Greenfield, Mass.
Richard Parsons, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.
James M. Paton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Calvin W. Pearson, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
Ernest M. Pease, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Henry T. Peck, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Tracy Peck, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (124 High St.).
Bernadotte Perrin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O. (837 Case Ave.).

Digitized by Google

Edward D. Perry, Columbia College, New York, N. Y. (133 East Fifty-fifth St.).
Edward E. Phillips, Marietta College, Marietta, O.
W. H. P. Phyfe, 12 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.
William T. Piper, Cambridge, Mass. (179 Brattle St.).
Samuel B. Platner, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
William Carey Poland, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (7 Cooke St.).
Louis Pollens, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Samuel Porter, National Deaf-Mute College, Washington, D. C.
William Porter, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
Edwin Post, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.
L. S. Potwin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O. (2108 Euclid Ave.).
John W. Powell, Washington, D. C.
Henry Preble, Rome, Italy (Baring Brothers).
George Prentice, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
Thomas R. Price, Columbia College, New York, N. Y. (212 Second Ave.).
Sylvester Primer, Charleston College, Charleston, S. C.
Louis Dwight Ray, 2125 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.
John W. Redd, Centre College, Danville, Ky.
Horatio M. Reynolds, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
George M. Richardson, Cambridge, Mass.
Rufus B. Richardson, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Arthur W. Roberts, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa.
Harley F. Roberts, Free Academy, Norwich, Conn.
David H. Robinson, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
William A. Robinson, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa.
F. E. Rockwood, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
Martin Luther Rouse, Toronto, Ont.
Lawrence Rust, Gambier, O.
Julius Sachs, Classical School, 38 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
Samuel G. Sanders, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex.
Wesley C. Sawyer, San José, Cal.
W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.
Henry Schliemann, Athens, Greece.
C. P. G. Scott, 76 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.
Charles D. Seely, State Normal School, Brockport, N. Y.
William J. Seelye, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Jotham B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass.
Thomas D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (112 College St.).
Charles C. Shackford, Brookline, Mass. (4 Walnut Terrace).
Robert Sharp, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.
Joseph Alden Shaw, Highland Military Academy, Worcester, Mass.
Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
James P. Sheraton, Wycliffe College, Toronto, Ont.

Digitized by Google

William D. Shipman, Buchtel College, Akron, O.
Paul Shorey, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Henry A. Short, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Helen W. Shute, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
Carl Siedhof, Jr., 32 West Cedar St., Boston, Mass.
E. G. Sihler, Classical School, 38 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
M. S. Slaughter, Hackettstown Institute, Hackettstown, N. J.
Benjamin E. Smith, *Century* Co., Union Sq., New York, N. Y.
Charles Smith, Sackville College, Sackville, N. B.
Charles Forster Smith, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Clement Lawrence Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Frank Webster Smith, State Normal School, Westfield, Mass.
Josiah R. Smith, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
Richard M. Smith, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.
Herbert Weir Smyth, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Edward Snyder, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.
George C. S. Southworth, Salem, O.
Edward H. Spieker, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Jonathan Y. Stanton, Bates College, Lewiston, Me.
M. Wilson Starling, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
Frederick Stengel, School of Mines, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
J. R. S. Sterrett, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.
William A. Stevens, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
Edward F. Stewart, Easton, Pa.
Austin Stickney, 35 West Seventeenth St., New York, N. Y.
Morris H. Stratton, Salem, N. J.
J. J. Stürzinger, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Charles W. Super, Ohio University, Athens, O.
Frank B. Tarbell, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Franklin Taylor, High School, Philadelphia, Pa. (629 North Twelfth St.).
John Phelps Taylor, Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
John Tetlow, Girls' High School, Boston, Mass.
J. Henry Thayer, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (67 Sparks St.).
William E. Thompson, Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N. Y.
Edward M. Tomlinson, Alfred University, Alfred Centre, N. Y.
Henry A. Todd, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Crawford H. Toy, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (7 Lowell St.).
James A. Towle, Robbins School, Norfolk, Conn.
James R. Truax, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
Alfred C. True, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
James S. Trueman, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.
Frank L. Van Cleef, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany.
Addison Van Name, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Digitized by Google

George M. Wahl, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.
Benjamin B. Warfield, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
Frederick M. Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Henry C. Warren, 67 Mount Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Minton Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
William E. Waters, Hughes High School, Cincinnati, O.
Benjamin W. Wells.
Andrew F. West, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
J. B. Weston, Christian Biblical Institute, Standfordville, N. Y.
L. K. Wharton, Liberty, Va.
A. S. Wheeler, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Conn.
Benjamin I. Wheeler, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
James R. Wheeler, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
Andrew C. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Horatio Stevens White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
J. Ernest Whitney, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Charles R. Williams, Associated Press, New York, N. Y.
John Williams White, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Henry Whitehorne, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
William Dwight Whitney, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Mills Whittlesey, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Alexander M. Wilcox, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
R. H. Willis, Wasco Academy, The Dalles, Oregon.
Daniel Wilson, University College, Toronto, Ont.
John Wilson, Victoria College, Cobourg, Ont.
S. Ross Winans, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
E. Lincoln Wood, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Henry Wood, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
W. G. Woodfin, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Frank E. Woodruff, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Charles Baker Wright, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Henry P. Wright, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (128 York St.).
John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (14 Avon St.).

[Number of Members, 365.]

THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS (ALPHABETIZED BY TOWN) SUBSCRIBE FOR THE ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Akron, O.: Buchtel College Library.
Albany, N. Y.: N. Y. State Library.
Amherst, Mass.: Amherst College Library.
Andover, Mass.: Phillips Academy Library.

Digitized by Google

Andover, Mass.: Theological Seminary Library.
Ann Arbor, Mich.: Michigan University Library.
Athens, Greece: American School of Classical Studies.
Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Library.
Baltimore, Md.: Peabody Institute.
Berea, Madison Co., Ky.: Berea College Library.
Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Library.
Boston, Mass.: Boston Athenæum.
Boston, Mass.: Boston Public Library.
Brooklyn, N. Y.: The Brooklyn Library.
Brunswick, Me.: Bowdoin College Library.
Buffalo, N. Y.: The Buffalo Library.
Burlington, Vt.: Library of University of Vermont.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard College Library.
Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Library.
Chicago, Ill.: Public Library.
Cleveland, O.: Library of Adelbert College of Western Reserve University.
College Hill, Mass.: Tufts College Library.
Columbus, O.: Ohio State University Library.
Crawfordsville, Ind.: Wabash College Library.
Detroit, Mich.: Public Library.
Easton, Pa.: Lafayette College Library.
Evanston, Ill.: Northeastern University Library.
Gambier, O.: Kenyon College Library.
Geneva, N. Y.: Hobart College Library.
Greencastle, Ind.: De Pauw University Library.
Hanover, N. H.: Dartmouth College Library.
Iowa City, Ia: Library of State University of Iowa.
Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Library.
Lincoln, Neb.: Library of State University of Nebraska.
Marietta, O.: Marietta College Library.
Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Library.
Milwaukee, Wis.: Public Library.
Minneapolis, Minn.: Athenæum Library.
Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Library.
Newton Centre, Mass.: Library of Newton Theological Institution.
New York, N. Y.: Astor Library.
New York, N. Y.: Library of The College of the City of New York (Lexington Ave. and Twenty-third St.).
New York, N. Y.: Union Theological Seminary Library (1200 Park Ave.).
Olivet, Eaton Co., Mich.: Olivet College Library.
Philadelphia, Pa.: American Philosophical Society.
Philadelphia, Pa.: The Library Company of Philadelphia.
Philadelphia, Pa.: The Mercantile Library.

Digitized by Google

Providence, R. I.: Brown University Library.
Rochester, N. Y.: Rochester University Library.
Springfield, Mass.: City Library.
Tokio, Japan: Library of Imperial University.
University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.: University Library.
Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress.
Washington, D. C.: United States Bureau of Education.
Waterville, Me.: Colby University Library.
Wellesley, Mass.: Wellesley College Library.
Worcester, Mass.: Free Public Library.

[Number of subscribing Institutions, 57.]

TO THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS HAVE BEEN SENT COMPLETE SETS (VOLUMES I.–XVIII.) OF THE TRANSACTIONS, GRATIS.

British Museum, London, England.
Royal Asiatic Society, London.
Philological Society, London.
Society of Biblical Archæology, London.
India Office Library, London.
Bodleian Library, Oxford.
Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, Scotland.
Trinity College Library, Dublin, Ireland.
Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Shanghai.
Japan Asiatic Society, Yokohama.
Public Library of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia.
Sir George Grey's Library, Cape Town, Africa.
Reykjavik College Library, Iceland.
University of Christiana, Norway.
University of Upsala, Sweden.
Russian Imperial Academy, St. Petersburg.
Austrian Imperial Academy, Vienna.
Anthropologische Gesellschaft, Vienna.
Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence, Italy.
Reale Accademia delle Scienze, Turin.
Société Asiatique, Paris, France.
Athénée Oriental, Louvain, Belgium.
Curatorium of the University, Leyden, Holland.
Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Batavia, Java.

Digitized by Google

Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, Berlin, Germany.
Royal Saxon Society of Sciences, Leipsic.
Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, Munich.
Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Halle.
Library of the University of Bonn.
Library of the University of Jena.
Library of the University of Königsberg.
Library of the University of Leipsic.
Library of the University of Tübingen.

Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

[Number of foreign Institutions, 35.]

[Total, (365 + 57 + 35 + 1 =) 458.]

Digitized by Google

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

Article I. — Name and Object.

1. This Society shall be known as "The American Philological Association."

2. Its object shall be the advancement and diffusion of philological knowledge.

Article II. — Officers.

1. The officers shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and Curator, and a Treasurer.

2. There shall be an Executive Committee of ten, composed of the above officers and five other members of the Association.

3. All the above officers shall be elected at the last session of each annual meeting.

Article III. — Meetings.

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association in the city of New York, or at such other place as at a preceding annual meeting shall be determined upon.

2. At the annual meeting, the Executive Committee shall present an annual report of the progress of the Association.

3. The general arrangements of the proceedings of the annual meeting shall be directed by the Executive Committee.

4. Special meetings may be held at the call of the Executive Committee, when and where they may decide.

Digitized by Google

Article IV. — Members.

1. Any lover of philological studies may become a member of the Association by a vote of the Executive Committee and the payment of five dollars as initiation fee, which initiation fee shall be considered the first regular annual fee.

2. There shall be an annual fee of three dollars from each member, failure in payment of which for two years shall *ipso facto* cause the membership to cease.

3. Any person may become a life member of the Association by the payment of fifty dollars to its treasury, and by vote of the Executive Committee.

Article V. — Sundries.

1. All papers intended to be read before the Association must be submitted to the Executive Committee before reading, and their decision regarding such papers shall be final.

2. Publications of the Association, of whatever kind, shall be made only under the authorization of the Executive Committee.

Article VI. — Amendments.

Amendments to this Constitution may be made by a vote of two-thirds of those present at any regular meeting subsequent to that in which they have been proposed.

Digitized by Google

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

THE annually published "Proceedings" of the American Philological Association contain an account of the doings at the annual meeting, brief abstracts of the papers read, reports upon the progress of the Association, and lists of its officers and members.

The annually published "Transactions" give the full text of such articles as the Executive Committee decides to publish. The Proceedings are bound with them as an Appendix.

The following tables show the authors and contents of the first eighteen volumes of Transactions: —

1869–1870. — Volume I.

Hadley, J.: On the nature and theory of the Greek accent.

Whitney, W. D.: On the nature and designation of the accent in Sanskrit.

Goodwin, W. W.: On the aorist subjunctive and future indicative with ὅπως and οὐ μή.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On the best method of studying the North American languages.

Haldeman, S. S.: On the German vernacular of Pennsylvania.

Whitney, W. D.: On the present condition of the question as to the origin of language.

Lounsbury, T. R.: On certain forms of the English verb which were used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On some mistaken notions of Algonkin grammar, and on mistranslations of words from Eliot's Bible, etc.

Van Name, A.: Contributions to Creole Grammar.

Proceedings of the preliminary meeting (New York, 1868), of the first annual session (Poughkeepsie, 1869), and of the second annual session (Rochester, 1870).

1871. — Volume II.

Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.

Allen, F. D.: On the so-called Attic second declension.

Whitney, W. D.: Strictures on the views of August Schleicher respecting the nature of language and kindred subjects.

Hadley, J.: On English vowel quantity in the thirteenth century and in the nineteenth.

March, F. A.: Anglo-Saxon and Early English pronunciation.

Bristed, C. A.: Some notes on Ellis's Early English Pronunciation.

Digitized by Google

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On Algonkin names for man.

Greenough, J. B.: On some forms of conditional sentences in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit.

Proceedings of the third annual session, New Haven, 1871.

1872. — Volume III.

Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: Words derived from Indian languages of North America.

Hadley, J.: On the Byzantine Greek pronunciation of the tenth century, as illustrated by a manuscript in the Bodleian Library.

Stevens, W. A.: On the substantive use of the Greek participle.

Bristed, C. A.: Erroneous and doubtful uses of the word *such*.

Hartt, C. F.: Notes on the Lingoa Geral, or Modern Tupí of the Amazonas.

Whitney, W. D.: On material and form in language.

March, F. A.: Is there an Anglo-Saxon language?

March, F. A.: On some irregular verbs in Anglo-Saxon.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: Notes on forty versions of the Lord's Prayer in Algonkin languages.

Proceedings of the fourth annual session, Providence, 1872.

1873. — Volume IV.

Allen, F. D.: The Epic forms of verbs in *άω*.

Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.

Hadley, J.: On Koch's treatment of the Celtic element in English.

Haldeman, S. S.: On the pronunciation of Latin, as presented in several recent grammars.

Packard, L. R.: On some points in the life of Thucydides.

Goodwin, W. W.: On the classification of conditional sentences in Greek syntax.

March, F. A.: Recent discussions of Grimm's law.

Lull, E. P.: Vocabulary of the language of the Indians of San Blas and Caledonia Bay, Darien.

Proceedings of the fifth annual session, Easton, 1873.

1874. — Volume V.

Tyler, W. S.: On the prepositions in the Homeric poems.

Harkness, A.: On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On an English vowel-mutation, present in *cag*, *keg*.

Packard, L. R.: On a passage in Homer's Odyssey (λ 81–86).

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On numerals in American Indian languages, and the Indian mode of counting.

Sewall, J. B.: On the distinction between the subjunctive and optatives modes in Greek conditional sentences.

Morris, C. D.: On the age of Xenophon at the time of the Anabasis.

Whitney, W. D.: *Φύσει* or *θέσει* — natural or conventional?

Proceedings of the sixth annual session, Hartford, 1874.

Digitized by Google

1875. — Volume VI.

Harkness, A.: On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On an English consonant-mutation, present in *proof, prove.*

Carter, F.: On Begemann's views as to the weak preterit of the Germanic verbs.

Morris, C. D.: On some forms of Greek conditional sentences.

Williams, A.: On verb-reduplication as a means of expressing completed action.

Sherman, L. A.: A grammatical analysis of the Old English poem "The Owl and the Nightingale."

Proceedings of the seventh annual session, Newport, 1875.

1876. — Volume VII.

Gildersleeve, B. L.: On *εἰ* with the future indicative and *ἐάν* with the subjunctive in the tragic poets.

Packard, L. R.: On Grote's theory of the structure of the Iliad.

Humphreys, M. W.: On negative commands in Greek.

Toy, C. H.: On Hebrew verb-etymology.

Whitney, W. D.: A botanico-philological problem.

Goodwin, W. W.: On *shall* and *should* in protasis, and their Greek equivalents.

Humphreys, M. W.: On certain influences of accent in Latin iambic trimeters.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On the Algonkin verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On a supposed mutation between *l* and *u*.

Proceedings of the eighth annual session, New York, 1876.

1877. — Volume VIII.

Packard, L. R.: Notes on certain passages in the Phaedo and the Gorgias of Plato.

Toy, C. H.: On the nominal basis on the Hebrew verb.

Allen, F. D.: On a certain apparently pleonastic use of *ἐς*.

Whitney, W. D.: On the relation of surd and sonant.

Holden, E. S.: On the vocabularies of children under two years of age.

Goodwin, W. W.: On the text and interpretation of certain passages in the Agamemnon of Aeschylus.

Stickney, A.: On the single case-form in Italian.

Carter, F.: On Willmann's theory of the authorship of the Nibelungenlied.

Sihler, E. G.: On Herodotus's and Aeschylus's accounts of the battle of Salamis.

Whitney, W. D.: On the principle of economy as a phonetic force.

Carter, F.: On the Kürenberg hypothesis.

March, F. A.: On dissimilated gemination.

Proceedings of the ninth annual session, Baltimore, 1877.

1878. — Volume IX.

Gildersleeve, B. L.: Contributions to the history of the articular infinitive.

Toy, C. H.: The Yoruban language.

Humphreys, M. W.: Influence of accent in Latin dactylic hexameters.

Sachs, J.: Observations on Plato's Cratylus.

Digitized by Google

Seymour, T. D.: On the composition of the Cynegeticus of Xenophon.
Humphreys, M. W.: Elision, especially in Greek.

Proceedings of the tenth annual session, Saratoga, 1878.

1879. — Volume X.

Toy, C. H.: Modal development of the Semitic verb.
Humphreys, M. W.: On the nature of caesura.
Humphreys, M. W.: On certain effects of elision.
Cook, A. S.: Studies in Heliand.
Harkness, A.: On the development of the Latin subjunctive in principal clauses.
D'Ooge, M. L.: The original recension of the De Corona.
Peck, T.: The authorship of the Dialogus de Oratoribus.
Seymour, T. D.: On the date of the Prometheus of Aeschylus.

Proceedings of the eleventh annual session, Newport, 1879.

1880. — Volume XI.

Humphreys, M. W.: A contribution to infantile linguistic.
Toy, C. H.: The Hebrew verb-termination *un*.
Packard, L. R.: The beginning of a written literature in Greece.
Hall, I. H.: The declension of the definite article in the Cypriote inscriptions.
Sachs, J.: Observations on Lucian.
Sihler, E. G.: Virgil and Plato.
Allen, W. F.: The battle of Mons Graupius.
Whitney, W. D.: On inconsistency in views of language.
Edgren, A. H.: The kindred Germanic words of German and English, exhibited with reference to their consonant relations.

Proceedings of the twelfth annual session, Philadelphia, 1880.

1881. — Volume XII.

Whitney, W. D.: On Mixture in Language.
Toy, C. H.: The home of the primitive Semitic race.
March, F. A.: Report of the committee on the reform of English spelling.
Wells, B. W.: History of the *a*-vowel, from Old Germanic to Modern English.
Seymour, T. D.: The use of the aorist participle in Greek.
Sihler, E. G.: The use of abstract verbal nouns in *-σις* in Thucydides.

Proceedings of the thirteenth annual session, Cleveland, 1881.

1882. — Volume XIII.

Hall, I. H.: The Greek New Testament as published in America.
Merriam, A. C.: Alien intrusion between article and noun in Greek.
Peck, T.: Notes on Latin quantity.
Owen, W. B.: Influence of the Latin syntax in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.
Wells, B. W.: The Ablaut in English.
Whitney, W. D.: General considerations on the Indo-European case-system.

Proceedings of the fourteenth annual session, Cambridge, 1882.

Digitized by Google

1883.—Volume XIV.

Merriam, A. C.: The Caesareum and the worship of Augustus at Alexandria.
Whitney, W. D.: The varieties of predication.
Smith, C. F.: On Southernisms.
Wells, B. W.: The development of the Ablaut in Germanic.

Proceedings of the fifteenth annual session, Middletown, 1883.

1884.—Volume XV.

Goodell, T. D.: On the use of the Genitive in Sophokles.
Tarbell, F. B.: Greek ideas as to the effect of burial on the future life of the soul.
Perrin, B.: The Crastinus episode at Palaepharsalus.
Peck, T.: Alliteration in Latin.
Von Jagemann, H. C. G.: Norman words in English.
Wells, B. W.: The Ablaut in High German.
Whitney, W. D.: Primary and Secondary Suffixes of Derivation and their exchanges.
Warren, M.: On Latin Glossaries. Codex Sangallensis, No. 912.

Proceedings of the sixteenth annual session, Hanover, 1884.

1885.—Volume XVI.

Easton, M. W.: The genealogy of words.
Goodell, T. D.: Quantity in English verse.
Goodwin, W. W.: Value of the Attic talent in modern money.
Goodwin, W. W.: Relation of the Πρόεδροι to the Πρυτάνεις in the Attic Βουλή.
Perrin, B.: Equestrianism in the Doloneia.
Richardson, R. B.: The appeal to sight in Greek tragedy.
Seymour, T. D.: The feminine caesura in Homer.
Sihler, E. G.: A study of Dinarchus.
Wells, B. W.: The vowels *e* and *i* in English.
Whitney, W. D.: The roots of the Sanskrit language.

Proceedings of the seventeenth annual session, New Haven, 1885.

1886.—Volume XVII.

Tarbell, F. B.: Phonetic law.
Sachs, J.: Notes on Homeric Zoölogy.
Fowler, H. N.: The sources of Seneca de Beneficiis.
Smith, C. F.: On Southernisms.
Wells, B. W.: The sounds *o* and *u* in English.
Fairbanks, A.: The Dative case in Sophokles.
The Philological Society, of England, and The American Philological Association: Joint List of Amended Spellings.

Proceedings of the eighteenth annual session, Ithaca, 1886.

Digitized by Google

1887. — Volume XVIII.

Allen, W. F.: The monetary crisis in Rome, A.D. 33.
Sihler, E. G.: The tradition of Cæsar's Gallic Wars, from Cicero to Orosius.
Clapp, E. B.: Conditional sentences in Aischylos.
Pease, E. M.: On the relative value of the manuscripts of Terence.
Smyth, H. W.: The Arcado-Cyprian dialect.
Wells, B. W.: The sounds *o* and *u* in English.
Smyth, H. W.: The Arcado-Cyprian dialect. — *Addenda.*
Proceedings of the nineteenth annual session, Burlington, 1887.

1888. — Volume XIX *(in press).*

The Proceedings of the American Philological Association are distributed gratis upon application until they are out of print.

Separate copies of articles printed in the Transactions are given to the authors for distribution.

The "Transactions *for*" any given year are not always published in that year. To avoid mistakes in ordering back volumes, please state — not the year of publication, but rather — the year *for* which the Transactions are desired, adding also the volume-number, according to the following table: —

The Transactions	for	1869	*and* 1870	form	Volume	I.
"	"	"	1871	form	Volume	II.
"	"	"	1872	"	"	III.
"	"	"	1873	"	"	IV.
"	"	"	1874	"	"	V.
"	"	"	1875	"	"	VI.
"	"	"	1876	"	"	VII.
"	"	"	1877	"	"	VIII.
"	"	"	1878	"	"	IX.
"	"	"	1879	"	"	X.
"	"	"	1880	"	"	XI.
"	"	"	1881	"	"	XII.
"	"	"	1882	"	"	XIII.
"	"	"	1883	"	"	XIV.
"	"	"	1884	"	"	XV.
"	"	"	1885	"	"	XVI.
"	"	"	1886	"	"	XVII.

Digitized by Google

The Transactions for 1887 form Volume XVIII.
" " " 1888 " " XIX.

The price of these volumes is $2.00 apiece, except Volume XV., for which $2.50 is charged. The first two volumes will not be sold separately.

REDUCTION IN THE PRICE OF COMPLETE SETS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES.

Single COMPLETE SETS of the Transactions (Volumes I.–XVIII.) will be sold to public libraries, until further notice, at *twenty-five* dollars a set.

It is especially appropriate that *American* Libraries should exert themselves to procure this series while it may be had. It is the work of *American* scholars, and contains many valuable articles not elsewhere accessible; and, aside from these facts, as the first collection of essays in general philology made in this country, it is sure to be permanently valuable for the history of American scholarship.

Digitized by Google

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

1889.

VOLUME XX.

Published by the Association.

BOSTON:
PRESS OF J. S. CUSHING & CO.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS OF VOL. XX.

I. The Vowel System of the Ionic Dialect 5
By Dr. HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

II. A New Source in Plutarch's Life of Cicero 139
By Dr. A. GUDEMAN.

III. Sex-denoting Nouns in American Languages 159
By ALBERT S. GATSCHET.

IV. Metrical Observations on a Northumbrianized Version of the Old English Judith 172
By Professor ALBERT S. COOK.

V. Notes on the Vocalism of Late West Saxon 175
By Professor ALBERT S. COOK.

APPENDIX: —

Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Session, Easton, Pa., 1889 iii
Treasurer's Report iv
List of Officers and Members xlix
Constitution of the Association lxi
Publications of the Association lxiii
Indices to Vols. I–XX.

Digitized by Google

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

1889.

I. — *The Vowel System of the Ionic Dialect.*

By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH,

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

Of that Greek dialect which appeals to the sympathies of the student of Greek literature only less instantly than does Attic, we may use the words of Thukydides in reference to one of the momentous periods of the history of his country: *ἐκλιπὲς τοῦτο ἦν τὸ χωρίον.* Half a century ago Ionic did not form a part of the pioneer undertaking of Ahrens; and at the present day, despite a few scattered German dissertations, the history of Ionic is still an unwritten history. Various causes have contributed to the delay in taking possession of so precious a legacy of opportunity bequeathed to his successors by the author of the *De Graecae linguae dialectis.* Of these causes doubtless one has been more potent than all others, — that there did not exist a collection of inscriptions so complete and so perfectly disposed that the scholar might with confidence compare the "testimony of the rocks" with the evidence of literature.

But now that we are equipped with a collection of Ionic inscriptions it becomes the more imperative that those who have at heart the history of Hellenic speech should attempt to cover that wide field from Homer to the Sophistic Renais-

Digitized by Google

sance, in order that at least a comprehensive outlook may be gained over the development of a dialect containing so generous a wealth of linguistic phenomena and standing in such intimate relations with the history of Hellenic thought.

Upon the present occasion I desire to portray, in somewhat detailed outline, the Ionic vowel system from the eighth century B.C. to the second century A.D., though part of my material reaches over into the following centuries.

As to the field surveyed by my paper, so far as the inscriptions are concerned, I have endeavored to utilize every form pertinent to a knowledge of Ionic phonology. Whenever it was necessary to compare the date of any phonetic change in Ionic with the date of a similar change in Attic, I have drawn the latter dialect into the range of vision. Of the lyric poets, especial attention has been devoted to those of Ionic birth (Archilochos, Simonides Amorginus, Hipponax, Ananios, Kallinos, Mimnermos, Xenophanes, and Phokylides); and I have treated in detail the dialect of Tyrtaios, Solon, and Theognis: Tyrtaios, a Lakonian by adoption, but a representative of the early Ionic elegy; Solon, in order to test the question how far his Muse is Ionic, how far Old-Attic; and Theognis, that we may obtain a complete survey of the language of the elegy down to the end of the sixth century. Herodotos I have examined with special reference to the interrelation of the Mss., and trust that but few points have been overlooked, though I am but too well aware how difficult it is to reach completeness in so wide a field. For the language of the philosophers, Anaxagoras of Klazomenai, Diogenes of Apollonia, Melissos of Samos, Herakleitos of Ephesos, have been investigated; and for the older medical dialect, those writings of Hippokrates which are least open to the suspicion of spuriousness. Of the pseudo-Ionists, Aretaios' *Αἰτίαι*, Arrian's *Ἰνδική*, and Lukian's *Syrian Goddess* and *Astronomy* are easily our chief sources; but I have placed under contribution the fragments of Abydenos' Assyrian History, Eusebios, and Eusebios Myndios, that we may realize the more vividly how persistent has been the influence exercised upon later prose by the Ionic dialect.

Digitized by Google

In this introduction I propose to touch only upon one or two matters which deal with the wider positions assumed in the course of the investigation.

From the point of view of the dialectologist, the history of Hellenic speech falls into four divisions:—

Period of primitive Greek.

Period of the life of single dialects.

Period of the contest of the Attic *κοινή* with the Doric *κοινή*.

Period of the existence of a universal *κοινή*.

Within the confines of the second period, Ionic is, broadly speaking, the dialect of the literary world from the eighth century until it was driven from its commanding position by Attic. Through it every creative effort of Greek thought, save the Doric choral ode and the Aiolic love song, found expression. Taken as a whole Ionic presents in its structure a uniformity far more consistent than that possessed by Doric. It is upon the evidence of the inscriptions alone that we are enabled to assert the existence of sub-divisions, which mark the course of Ionic emigration from the mainland of Greece. These sub-dialects are: I. Ionic of Euboia and colonies. II. Ionic of the Kyklades. III. Ionic of Asia Minor and of the adjacent islands and their colonies.

I. Western Ionic is the dialect of Euboia and colonies (Chalkis, Kyme, Olynthos, Amphipolis, Eretria, Oropos, Styra). It still possesses the rough breathing; names derived from *κλέος* terminate in *-κλέης*, not in *-κλῆς*; the genitive of proper names whose second component part is an *-ι* stem, ends in *-ιδος*, not in *-ιος*. These peculiarities and certain others (*ει* < *ηι*, *οι* < *ωι*, and cases of *ττ* for *σσ*) testify to what an extent the political supremacy of Athens has succeeded in coloring the speech of the rear-guard of Ionism. When Western Ionic differs from the Ionic of the other divisions, it differs by its preference for Attic forms, save in its possession of rhotacism, found nowhere else upon Ionic territory, and whose ultimate provenance is still a matter of dispute. Another point of isolation is that Western Ionic alone produced no literature. Whatever artistic capacity the Euboians

Digitized by Google

possessed tended in the direction of the manufacture of vases.

II. ISLAND IONIC has -κλῆς, not -κλέης; -ιος, not -ιδος. Retaining the rough breathing, which is well attested in the case of the Parian Archilochos, Island Ionic thus forms a bridge between Western and Eastern Ionic. Up to the present time, no mint-marks of local difference can be observed in the speech of the various islands, and the sole ground for a separation into two sections, (1) Naxos, Keos; (2) Delos, Paros, Siphnos, is a difference in the writing of η = I.E. *ē* and η = I.E. *ā*. But at best this palaeograpic distinction, which seems to betoken a difference in pronunciation, does not hold good for all time, having been retained a century longer by the first group than by the second.

III. The chief characteristic of EASTERN IONIC is the displacement of the rough breathing at a very early period. The inscriptions speak with no uncertain voice against the existence of the *spiritus asper* save in compounds, and literature confirms this testimony to a considerable extent. Asiatic Ionic, like that of the Kyklades, has -κλῆς and -ιος.

Now it is a modern discovery that far more satisfactory tests of dialect coloring are yielded by phonology and by schemes of inflection than by vocabulary and style. As far back as we trace the history of the dialects we find that, even when recourse is had to epic formulae, these formulae assume the color of the dialect in question. The Korkyraian of the seventh century says ἐπ' Ἀράθθοιο ῥοϝαῖσι, and not ῥοϝηῖσι, because his dialect is an Â, not an H, dialect. Now if we apply this criterion of phonology and inflection to the Ionic of Asia Minor in the endeavor to test the accuracy of Herodotos' famous quadrilateral division, we find that the following forms have been held by various scholars to be mint-marks of the four sub-dialects: —

1. *Miletos:* ἱερέω < ἱερῆο, gen. to ἱερής, also the Arkado-Kypr. form of ἱερεύς.

λάψεται in Mil. κατελάφθη in Zeleia, from λαμβάνω.

2. *Ephesos:* dat. in -ει, not in -ῑ, from -ι stems.

3. *Chios-Erythrai:*

Digitized by Google

Δεόνυσος for Δίονυσος.
Πειθεῦ and other gen. in -ευ in the Â decl.
'Ασίω and other gen. in -ω in the Â decl.
ἐσλῆς, not ἐσθλῆς.
πρῆχμα for πρῆγμα.
ἀνηρίθευτος for ἀνερίθευτος.
πόλεως for πόλιος.
The subjunctive in -ει, as ποιήσει.
4. *Samos:* δημιοργός for δημιουργός.

But of all these forms, only those from Samos and Miletos can stand the test of a closer examination; and the Milesian and Samian forms quoted are, upon any sober view, but indifferent data for the support of a quadrilateral division on the score of phonology and inflection. Now the question arises: May not Herodotos have regarded *vocabulary* as the criterion of his four sub-dialects? That such a point of view could be assumed by the ancients is evident from the remark of Hermogenes, that the dialect of Hekataios was pure Ionic (ἄκρατος), but that of Herodotos was mixed (κεκραμένη). While I have no hesitation in referring this remark of the rhetorician to differences in vocabulary and in style (especially since it assists in lifting much of the obscurity in which the Herodotean dialect is enveloped), nevertheless I find myself unable to support any view which holds that there is evidence cogent enough to warrant the belief that the intermingling of Ionians with Lydians and Karians gave birth to a Lydian-Ionic or a Karian-Ionic, which Herodotos might have regarded as sub-dialects of Ionic; and even if such evidence existed, it would not fail of being impeached at the bar of modern conceptions of dialectology, where the presence of sporadic loan-forms from contiguous languages is not recognized as essentially determinative of the character of any dialect.

All Ionic monuments that contain an admixture of non-Hellenic words inflect these words as if they were of Hellenic stock. The Lygdamos stelè from Halikarnassos treats the gentlemen of Karia as if they were full-blooded Ionians, and the billingsgate of Hipponax, drawn from the slums of Ephesos, is inflected after the most orthodox Ionic fashion.

Digitized by Google

There did doubtless exist sub-dialects of Asiatic Ionic, but the accuracy of the Herodotean division is not yet attested by the monuments under our control. From the point of view of literature there are indications that there existed a Milesian dialect which claimed preëminence over all others. At Miletos were born Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Kadmos, Dionysios, and Hekataios, and it is not the baseless fabric of a vision to conjecture that Herodotos himself may have used a dialect not greatly dissimilar to the speech of a city that was the eye of Ionia as Athens of Greece.

This leads us to the delicate question of the interrelation of the sources of our knowledge of Ionic. On the one hand we have the inscriptional, on the other the literary, sources, which may be divided into: (1) the elegiac and iambic poets; (2) Herodotos, Hippokrates, their contemporaries, immediate predecessors, and immediate successors; (3) the pseudo-Ionists of the Ionic Renaissance.

The language of the inscriptions alone is not an absolute criterion of the genuineness of an Ionic form unless the inscription is older than 400 B.C. and contains no trace of what is specifically Attic. When the language of the inscriptions, with this limitation, agrees with that of the poets, we have the surest criterion of the Ionic character of the form in question that is possible under the circumstances; and against this evidence the fluctuating orthography of Herodotean and Hippokratean Mss. can make no stand.

As in the domain of thought, so in that of language, the elegy occupies a different field from iambic poetry. Upon the dividing line of the frequency of adoption of Homeric forms, we may separate Theognis from the earlier elegists. In its possession of legacies from the earliest Ionic period, and in its use of Homeric Aiolisms, the dialect of the Megarian poet stands in closer touch with the language of the epic period than does the idiom of any of his predecessors of the elegiac guild. That the early elegists used Aiolisms seems to me an incontrovertible fact which has withstood all the assaults of the recent investigations of Fick.

Digitized by Google

Now there is a wide chasm between the Aiolism of the earlier elegy and the adventitious Aiolisms of Chios. The latter are distinctively prose forms, the former are only such as had been consecrated to use by the epos. Here we must clearly grasp two facts: (1) that an elegiac poet could adopt only Homeric Aiolisms, and (2) that no elegiac poet, not of Ionic birth, could borrow from a genuine Ionian, forms that are specifically Ionic. Solon has his Atticisms, Tyrtaios and Theognis their Dorisms, but they may not use forms that are specifically Ionic. Our inscriptions show that what is not Homeric in the elegy is drawn from the soil whence the elegy sprang; and that the forms taken from the living speech of the poet's time are few in comparison to those found in iambic poetry.

If the language of the iambographers has but little love for archaic Ionisms, it has still less for Aiolisms. The language of Archilochos, Simonides of Amorgos, and Hipponax, is, with due allowance for the perverse influence of copyists who had the Attic norm in their mind's eye, practically the same as that of the inscriptions. In regarding the Ionisms of Attic tragedy as a reflection of the Ionic period of the cultivation of the iambus just as its Dorisms proclaim the birthplace of the choral ode, I regret to be obliged to differ from so eminent a scholar as Rutherford, who holds that to the similarity between Old-Attic and Ionic is due the Ionic ingredient of tragedy.

In great part the language of Herodotos is supported by that of the inscriptions, and much of what is genuine Ionic in Herodotos is also Attic. Many forms which occur nowhere else outside of Herodotos find an easy explanation in the laws of Greek morphology. Of the remaining forms, aside from the out-and-out barbarisms, one part was obsolescent, another, and the larger part, obsolete, at the time the genius of the Ionic race created literary prose.

In the course of the following investigation my primary purpose has been to let the facts themselves show how great is the difference existing between what is certainly Ionic of the fifth century and what is ordinarily proclaimed as Ionic

Digitized by Google

of the fifth century upon the authority of Herodotean Mss. While I do not deny that Herodotos may have adopted forms that are specifically Homeric in passages that are strongly tinged with an epic tone, nevertheless my survey of the evidence has led me to the conclusion that the original text of Herodotos was written in the dialect of his time, while the bulk of the variations from that dialect is due to a *μεταχαρακτηρισμός*, which I would place about the first century of our era.

In the history of Greek literature *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* proceeded on two lines: either in the direction of Atticizing the dialect texts, a fact vouched for by Galen as usual in his time, or in the direction of the substitution of dialect forms in the light of contemporaneous dialectological theories. The text of Alkman, of Korinna, and, to a lesser extent, that of Pindar, bear witness to the activity of the *μεταγραψάμενοι* in the latter direction.

The writers of the Hadrianic age who imitated Herodotos and Hippokrates have received the full shock of this wave of speculation as regards Ionic. But from the point of view of higher criticism, the "pseudo-Ionisms" of Lukian and Aretaios are on a different footing from the same forms in Stein's or Holder's text of Herodotos. In the one case they are the result of genuine imitation; in the other, these forms never existed in Herodotos. A further estrangement from genuine Ionic was produced by the occasional insertion of such hyper-Ionic formations into the texts of these Ionists, as are not found except in some Mss. of Herodotos.

One of the causes of this *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* was the inability of the dialectologists to distinguish between the Ionic of the Homeric period and the Ionic of the fifth century. It was all Ionic Greek to these sciolists. The cardinal error of the *μεταγραψάμενοι* was the foisting of uncontracted forms upon Herodotos. This was caused by inability to distinguish between those vocalic combinations that normally remained uncontracted and those which by the fifth century had suffered contraction, and by their failing to recognize that *εο* and *εω*, even if written in the uncontracted form, had fre-

Digitized by Google

quently become diphthongal as early as the seventh century. My paper will adduce evidence that this μεταχαρακτηρισμός has not affected alike all the early writers in Ionic, and that upon the authority of good Mss. the original form may very often be reinstated.

All references to my own treatment of those portions of Ionic not discussed in the following pages, will be found in a work on the Greek dialects to be published by the Clarendon Press. Under the appropriate sections I have generally attempted to explain the character of the phonetic processes at work, excluding any elaborate defence of the positions assumed. I have therefore adduced the names of others who have brought forward explanations either agreeing with, or differing from, my treatment of the forms under discussion. In a few instances the desire to institute comparisons with other dialects, chiefly Attic, has caused me to include in an examination of Ionic phonology, certain forms which do not strictly belong in such an examination (*e.g.* § 62).

The Short Vowels.

A.

1. First we may treat that ᾰ derived from ε, which is chiefly seen in conjunction with ρ. The Ionic dialect here presents no features sharp enough to separate it from allied dialects.

κράτος = Aiolic κρέτος. κράτος, Hdt. VIII, 2, with κάρτος in *A B d*; cf. καρτερή, VIII, 12, with κρατερή in other Mss.[1] Archil. 26 has καρτερός, a form that comes to light upon inscriptions: Halik. καρτερούς 238_{29}, and so in Attic and Kretan (Gortyna); κράτιστος appears in Κρατιστόλεως, Thasos (Louvre) 12 B, but was not used by Hdt.; Epic κάρτιστος. The Ionic dialect alone possesses the strong form of the adjective (κρέσσων). In the inscriptions names in καρτ- and κρατ- occur: Μνησικάρτ(η)ς, Styra 19_{262}; Καρτίης, 19_{317}; Ἐπικράτης, 19_{360}; Λυσι-, 19_{247}; Λεωκρατίδης Styra, 19_{21}; Κράτιος Keos, 44 A 8.

θάρσος, Hdt. VII, 9 γ (θράσος in *R*); Homeric and Attic θάρσος and θράσος. The only trace of the strong form θέρσος (cf. Aiolic) appears

[1] Ionic κάρτα, Greg. Corinth, *d. d. I.*, § 58.

Digitized by Google

upon an Erythraian inscription (No. 200). The fact that the inscription is in metre renders it doubtful whether names in *-θερσης* should be regarded as Ionic, though they occur elsewhere in dialects that show no predilection in favor of the *ερ* forms. See Pape's Lexicon. Doubtless the Homeric names in *-θερσ-* did much to popularize this form in such dialects.

The prefix *ἀρι-* seems to be Ionic as contrasted with Aiolic *ἐρι-* (Hinrich's *de Hom. eloc. vest. Aeol.*, p. 64). *Ἀρίμνηστος* occurs upon a Kean inscription, No. 44, B 11.

βάραθρον, Hdt. VII, 133, as in Attic; Homeric *βέρεθρον* Θ 14; Arkad. *ζέρεθρον*.

ταρσιά, Sim. Amorg. 39, from Et. Mag. 764_{25}; cf. Hesychios *ταρσιήν · τὴν τρασιάν*. Et. Gud. 256 quotes from an elegiac poet *τρασιῆς*; cf. *τερσῆνω* in Homer. *τερσιά* is a very late formation (Julian). *τρασ-* is morphologically older than *ταρσ-*. A variation between *αρ* and *ρα* in order to lighten consonantal weight is seen in a Karian name, Halik. 240_{57}, *Ἰμβράσσιδος*; *ibid.* 58, *Ἰμβάρσιδος*.

The Ionic dialect was less elastic than Doric as regards its preference for the weak *α* before or after *ρ* in verbal forms (from original *ερ*). Thus, Herodotos adopts *τρέχω* (VII, 57) *τρέψω, στρέψω*, following in the wake of Homer, while he accepts *τράπω* (I, 63) in the present, despite Attic-epic *τρέπω*. In the future and first aorist the *ε*-forms hold their ground in Ionic, whereas in Kretan we have *ἐπιτραψῶ*. On the variation between *τρέπω* and *τράπω*, cf. Bredow, p. 145. In employing *τρέπω*, not *τράπω*, Lukian follows in the wake of Hdt. (*d. d. S.* 7, 39, *Astr.* 3). Aretaios has but one sure example of *τράπω*, while Hippokrates inclines in favor of the other form.

When other dialects, notably Aiolic or those allied to Aiolic, have *ρο* or *ορ*, Ionic almost invariably adopts *ρα* or *αρ*. See below on *βρόταχος, πορδακός* § 18. Hdt. III, 86, has *ἀστραπή*, with which may be compared Homeric *στεροπή* and *ἀστεροπή*. Kyprian has *στροπά* (Hesychios *στορπά*). In verbal inflection whenever *ορ* occurs it is the *ablaut* of *ερ*, not the Aiolic form of *αρ*.

καρδίη, Hdt. III, 35, a form not unknown in Homer (B 452, Λ 12), though the poet generally adopts *κραδίη*. Ionic, Attic and Aiolic are here on a plane. The Kyprian has *κόρζα*.

In the variation between *αρ* and *ρα* we can discover no dialect affinities in the wider sense.

Digitized by Google

2. Other forms with A parallel to E are:

τάμνω occurs in Hdt., though not without variation in favor of τέμνω, and is a present formed from the aorist of τέμω (*Iliad*, N 707) (ταμών < τm̥μ-οντ-). Whether τάμνω, which occurs as early as Homer (Γ 105) and Hesiod, and is found in Pindar, Kretan, and the Heraklean tablets, is more ancient than τέμνω, which is derived from τέμω by the infixing of ν,[1] is not certain. τέμνω is in fact no stranger to Homer (γ 175), and is the regular form in Attic. The inscriptions indicate the preference of Ionic and Attic most clearly. In the former we have ἔταμον (Halik. 238$_{44}$; Kyzikos, 108, B 8), in the latter ἔτεμον without exception. The ε of ἔτεμον is due to that of τέμνω.

Hippokrates and the pseudo-Ionist Aretaios use τάμνω; Lukian has τέμνω, *S* 15, τάμνω, *S* 51, 60; Demokr., *frag. mor.* 194, has τάμνων.

α for Attic ε occurs in the Ionic ὑπόγαιος (also late Attic), μεσόγαιος, κατάγαιος, μελάγγαιος, βαθύγαιος in Hdt.; Attic -γεια, -γεως (ὑπόγεως is quoted from Hippokrates, though not from a treatise that is colored with Ionisms). There is here no direct interrelation of α and ε, -γαιος and -γειος having been each derived from different ground-forms. See the declension of γῆ in Ionic.

On the forms ἔπειτα, εἵνεκα, see under *Adverbs*, etc. On -αιᾰ,-ειᾰ, -οιᾰ, see below under H, § 45, 46.

ψακάς, Hdt. III, 10, according to Stein, though ψεκάς is supported by Mss. authority and by Eustathios. Moiris, 419, held that ψεκάς was Attic, but not so acceptable a form. Cf. ψῶχος < ψᾱκ.

Ἀγβάτανα is the form used by Hdt., Ktesias (and Aischylos) for Ἐκβάτανα. The Mss. of Hdt. show constant fluctuation between these two forms, though Steph. Byz. distinctly states that Ἀγβάτανα is Herodotean.

3. Ionic A = Attic H.

μεσαμβρίη, Hdt. and Arrian, 3, 25, 39 (elsewhere the Attic form). Cf. Eustathios on the Odyss. 1714 = 478, Greg. Corinth. p. 444, 654, Schmidt, *Voc.* I, 119.

ἀμφισβατέω, Zeleia 113, 18, and in Hdt. IV, 14[2]; IX, 74. This form is apparently not confined to Ionic unless Rhodian ἀμφισβασίας,

[1] Unless τάμνω be derived directly from τm̥νώ, in which case we have αμ = m̥ in a syllable originally atonic.

[2] The manuscripts here agree in ἀμφισβασίας (cf. VIII, 81), but have ἀμφισβητέειν.

Digitized by Google

ἀμφεσβάτει, C. I. G. 2905, Aiolic ἀμφισβατημένων, C. D. I. 214_{25}, can be shown to have ᾱ = Ionic η.

If these non-Ionic forms can be shown to have ᾱ, weight must be attached to Brugmann's suggestion that an Ionic ἀμφισβᾰτέω is due to the ignorance of scribes who connected the latter part with βαίνω, βάσις, βατός; *Morph. Unter.* I, 22. But there is no proof that the α of the Aiolic and of the Rhodian forms is not short; and furthermore the inscriptional form from Zeleia proves conclusively that the Herodotean ἀμφισβᾰτέω is not due to blundering ignorance. Perhaps the forms in η stood in an ablaut relation to those in ᾱ.

λάξεσθαι, Hdt. VII, 144, λάξιν, IV, 21, have their ᾰ from the present stem as λάψεται, Miletos, 100_4. The converse procedure appears in the New Test. λήμψομαι, a form found on Lykian inscript. C. I. G. 4244_6, 4247_{20}, 4253_{13}, and in the *Papyr. du Louvre*, 14, 17.[1] It is due to a confusion between λήψομαι and λάμψομαι.

The form without nasal comes to light upon Attic vases (Λά(μ)πων, Λά(μ)πος in Kretschmer's collection, *K. Z.* XXIX, p. 436), though here the comparison of λάψεται is not so pertinent as Kretschmer supposes. I would prefer to class Λά(μ)πων, etc., with Νύ(μ)φη rather than regard λάψεται as derived from λά(μ)ψεται despite the Herodotean λάμψομαι, ἐλάμφθην, λαμπτέος. We have κατελάφθη, Zeleia, 113_7, and λελάβηκα, καταλελαβήκει in Hdt. (IV, 79; III, 42), λέλαμμαι in Hdt. and Hippokr., ἀναλελάφθαι in Hippokr. III, 308, according to Littré, with ample Mss. support.[2] I cannot follow Bechtel in branding as spurious the Herodotean λάμψεαι, I, 199, λάμψεσθαι, IX, 108, λαμφθεῖσαι, VI, 92, merely on the ground that λάψεται is a well attested Milesian form, and that Herodotos probably made use of the Milesian dialect, as is claimed by Wilamowitz, *Zeitschr. für Gymn.-wes.* XXXI, 645. If λήψομαι, and λήμψομαι could be formed, why not λάμψομαι? λάμψεσθαι in fact occurs upon the great inscription from Andania, Ditt. *Syll.* 388_{67}, though the genuine Doric was λαψοῦμαι, Epicharmos, 18, Theokr. I, 4. Cf. also the late aorist ἐξέλαμψα, Diog. Laert. I, 85. λάμψομαι is now generally banished from Hdt.'s text, and παραλήψηται in Hipp. rests upon shadowy evidence.

Proper names in Ἀγε- or Ἀγε-, which run parallel to those in Ἡγε-, are from ἄγω, the *asper* being borrowed from ἡγέομαι (> sāg). Cf.

[1] λήμψῃ is a probable conjecture in Sterrett's *Epigr. Journey*, Papers of the Am. School, II, 56, VI; cf. 58, XIX.

[2] Veitch, however, supports ἀναλελάμφθαι. Cf. Schmidt, *Voc.* I, 118.

Digitized by Google

Lokrian ἄγειν. The Doric Ἀγησίλαος (Perinthos, 234, B 5) has the *lenis* from ἄγω.

Ionic does not differ from the other dialects in offering -ᾰ in the nominative parallel to -η; *e.g.* τόλμᾰ, Hdt. VII, 135, and Eurip. Ion. 1264 = τόλμᾱ, Pind. Ol. XIII, 11. In many cases this ᾰ after ρ represents the pre-Hellenic suffix -ιᾰ, *iota* having been transferred to the previous syllable, *e.g.* μοῖρα (cf. Bechtel, 265, *Adesp.*). The tendency to hyperionize Herodotos has led to the form μοίρη in a few Mss. (*e.g.* μίη μοίρη, IV, 120).[1] That the grammarians held η to be the unvarying mark of the Ionic dialect appears from Greg. Corinth., p. 390, τὸ ᾱ εἰς ῑ τρέπουσιν . . Ἥρα Ἥρη, σφαῖρα σφαίρη, Gramm. Meerm. p. 650, τὰ εἰς ᾱ ἐυθείας εἰς ῑ τρέπουσιν οἷον Ἥρα Ἥρη, χώρα χώρη, ὥρα ὥρη, σπεῖρα σπείρη, where dialectal forms are confused with pan-Hellenic formations (σφαῖρα, σπεῖρα).[2] Many proper names ending in -ᾰ have suffered hyperionization in the Mss. of Hdt.; *e.g.* Ὄσση, Αἰγίνη, Τανάγρη. The index to Holder's or Stein's edition of Hdt. will supply the detail of names in -ειᾰ, -οιᾰ, -αιᾰ, -ειη, -οιη, -αιη.

At the present day the explanation of many words in -ᾰ is still uncertain. Many belong to the class of which μοῖρα is an example (μορ̯ια); thus γέφ-ῡρα, σφ-ῦρα are probably to be derived from -ῠριᾰ. The cause of the ᾰ in other words is obscure; *e.g.* χάραδρα, Hdt. IX, 102, while Stein reads Χαράδρα, VIII, 33, name of a Phokian town. Dissimilation may be here at work, unless we admit with Stein and Holder the Attic χαράδρα.

NOTE.—The reverse process to ᾰ for η is found in the Ionic Σμύρνη and πρύμνη. Hdt. I, 15, 149, has Σμύρνη (cf. also III, 107); Lukian φων. κρισ. 9 Ζμύρνα. The intermediate Σμύρνη is frequent upon inscriptions (Kaibel 143, 376, 657). πρυμνή may be an adjective to πρυμνός. See Brugmann, Saxon Soc. Reports, 1883, 191. πρύμνᾰ is then an analogue of πρῷρα.

In the feminine forms of adjectives from υ stems, where Herodotos regularly has ᾰ, the pseudo-Ionists not infrequently have η. Lukian *Syr.* ἡμισέη 14, θηλέην 15, 51; Arrian, πλατείην 16, τραχείη 23, 37 (cf. 32); βαθέη 27; Eusebios § 5 ἰθείη, Euseb. Mynd. 63, εὐρέη.

4. Interchange of A and O.

In a few instances α and ο seem to be interchangeable sounds, though the law governing this interrelation has not been formulated

[1] Hyperionic μοίρη, Lukian, *Astr.* 10; Euseb. § 9.

[2] See Misteli, K. Z. XVII, 177; XIX, 119; Osthoff, Forsch. II, 25; Brugmann, M. U. II, 201; Grundriss, I § 639; Johansson, K. Z. XXX, 411.

Digitized by Google

in all cases (cf. below on ο). So far as Ionic is concerned we have the following forms where Ionic α = ο of other dialects. ἀρρωδέω, Hdt. I, 9, 111, 156, III, 119, etc., ἀρρωδίη, IV, 140, etc., and attested by the Et. Mag. p. 632_{43}. Attic has ὀρρωδέω, Hesychios ὀρρωδία, ὀρρωδέως, etc., and Lukian, too, the Attic form. Hippokrates, 618_{42}, and Aretaios, *Caus. M. Ac.*, 2, 2, have the ο form. Probably assimilation of α to ο has here been caused by the influence of the ω of the following syllable (Schmidt, K. Z. XXV, 112). Etymologists are generally silent as to the derivation of this word. *Horrere* is probably φρίσσω, and cannot be connected. The Ionic form deserves special note, since it is only very rarely that Ionic differs from Attic in its use of α and ο.

The question as to the interrelation of α and ο assumes a different form in the case of proper names. In the Mss. of Hdt. there is a constant fluctuation between the readings Ἀρταξέρξης and Ἀρτοξέρξης, the latter obtaining in Ktesias and Plutarch, though Plutarch, in the *de malig. Herod.*, ascribes the form in α to the historian. Cf. also Steph. Byz. *s. v.* Ἀρταῖα. Ἀρταξέρξης occurs upon the inscription from Mylasa, 248, ABC, and would seem to be a closer reproduction of Arta-khsatrā than Ἀρτοξέρξης, which Stein adopts, VI, 98,[1] VII, 106, 151, 152, though the form in α is not unsupported. In other names Stein does not hesitate to read Ἀρτο-, *e.g.* Ἀρτοβαζάνης, VII, 2, Ἀρτοζώστρη, VI, 43, though in the case of the former name Thom. Mag. 299_{16}, testifies to the form in Ἀρτα-. Nor is Stein consistent, since we find Ἀρτάβανος, IV, 83, VII, 10, 11, 17, 47; Ἀρτάβαζος, VII, 66, etc.; Ἀρταβάτης, VII, 65; Ἀρταφρένης, V, 25, and other names in Ἀρτα-. He adopts Ἀστροβάκου, VI, 69, where *R* has Ἀστρα-.

In any event no Ionic change of α to ο may be deduced from the uncertainty attendant upon the Mss. fluctuation. The Persian names in Ἀρτυ- (Ἀρτύβιος, Ἀρτύφιος, Ἀρτυστώνη) are not to be held to be instances of the final effort of a phonetic movement which began with Ἀρτα- and reached Ἀρτυ- through Ἀρτο-, as has been held to have been the case with κατά, κατό, and κατύ. The forms in Ἀρτο- are due, not to an interchange of α and ο (§ 18), but to the fondness for ο- stems in composition.

5. A in relation to Y.

ἐκαλινδέετο, Hdt. III, 52, compared with κυλίνδεται, Sim. Amorg. VII, 4, κατακυλισθῇ, Hdt. V, 16, must not be regarded as an instance

[1] Cf. his note on this passage in his annotated edition, and Fick, *Spracheinheit*, p. 406.

Digitized by Google

of the interchange of *α* and *υ*, and much less as a proof of the greater age of *καλινδέω* (Curtius, *Etym.*[5], p. 715). An original *qel* sound = Greek *κλ*, becomes in Greek *κυλ* in weak case forms, cf. *κύκλος* < *qéklos*. With *κυψέλη*, *κάμψα*, capsula, and *κύλιξ*, calix, are to be classed *καλινδέω*, *κυλινδέω*, Germ. *quellen*.

The non-Ionic (Arkadian) form *κατύ* does not invalidate the above explanation, since it is derived from **κατό* (*κατόπερ* Halikarn. 238_{43} is from *ὅπερ*), which in turn is an analogue of *ὑπό*; **κατό* becomes *κατύ*, as *ὑπό* becomes *ὑπύ* (Kyme, 3 A). This is better than to assume that the forms in *α* and *υ* are proethnic; cf. Lettic-Lith. *sa* and Lith. *su*, Lith. *ga*, *gu*.

E.

6. Ionic *ερ* for *αρ* of other dialects.

The Ionic dialect in a few cases has made use of the strong forms in *ερ*, though not to the same extent as Aiolic.

ἔρσην: *ἔρσενος*, Hdt. I, 109, *ἔρσενες* I, 193, *ἐρσένων* I, 192, *ἔρσενας* I, 193. The Mss., notably *R*, have the Attic form, which must have been Ionic also, since it comes to light upon the very old Thasian inscription (Bechtel, vs. 68, *ἄρσεν*). Homer has *ἄρσην* Θ 7, which is doubtless Ionic, since *ἔρσην* is Aiolic (C. D. I. 293_6). That both the strong and the weak form should co-exist in one and the same dialect need not surprise us. Thessalian and Boeotian (perhaps even Ionic, see on *θράσος*, above § 1) have both *θερσ-* and *θαρσ-*, two forms living together as mother and daughter. The only other dialect which has *ἔρσης* is, I believe, Kretan: Gortyna Tables, X, 52, *ἔρσενες* X, 49, *ἐρσένων*. In the other dialects *ἄρσην* prevails: Attic *ἄρρ[ε]νος* C. I. A. II, 678, B 55–378 B.C., Elean *ϝάρρενορ* = *ἄρρενος*, C. D. I. 1152, Lakon. *ἄρσης*, C. I. G. 1464_9 (first cent. B.C.). See Fick, G. G. A. 1883, p. 117; Schmidt, K. Z. XXV, 23, 43. Hippokrates, Lukian, and Arrian have the *α* form.

τέσσερες: *τέσσερες*, *τεσσερεσκαίδεκα*, *τεσσερεκαιδεκάτη*, *τεσσεράκοντα*, *τεσσερακοντόργυιος*, are found in Hdt. with occasional lapses in favor of the Attic forms (see Bredow, p. 136). Upon inscriptions we meet with *τέσσερας*, 148_{91}, a comparatively late document from Ephesos, *τεσσέρων*, 104, B 66, Thasos, middle of the fourth century, with *τεσσάρων* on the same inscription, lines 62 and 63; *τεσσάρων* occurs also in No. 114, F (Zeleia), which dates shortly after the battle of Granikos. *τέσσερα*, Teos, 157_{18} (the stone has TEZEPA); *τέσ(σ)αρες*, 159_9, Teos, with but one Σ upon the stone. *τεσσεράκοντα*, 104_{52},

Digitized by Google

Thasos, 111_{11}, Kyzikos;[1] τεσσ[ερα]κ[ό]ντων, 174, C 16, Chios, and τεσ(σ)ερακαιεβδο[μη]ϙοντούτης, 58, Paros. Arkadian and Ionic alone have ερ. Arkad. τεσσεράκοντα, Foucart, 352 n. (late).

Ἀρταφρένης is adopted as the genuine reading by Stein in every instance, though the Mss. of Hdt. constantly vary between the form in -φρένης and that in -φέρνης (V, 25, 30, 31, 32, 35, 73, etc.). Aeschylos, *Persae*, 21, 776, has Ἀρταφρένης. In like manner Stein reads Ἰνταφρένης, III, 70, 78, 118, 119. Upon an Attic inscription, C. I. A. I, 64, B 14 (410–405 B.C.), we find Τισ]σαφρένην, which ensures the correctness of the form in -φρένης (cf. Old Persian *-franā*), and stamps that in -φέρνης, so popular in later Greek, as a folk's etymology in the direction of φέρω. G. Meyer, Gr. Gr. § 175, note 1. The above-quoted Attic inscription is important evidence that the form used in the treaty, Thukydides, VIII, 27, is incorrect. See Kirchhoff in *Sitzungsberichte d. Berliner Akad.*, 1884.

On θέρσος in = θέρσης upon a metrical inscription from Erythrai, see above § 1, under θράσος.

On κρέσσων, cf. below § 13.

In suffixes: χλιερός is said to be Ionic for χλιαρός, in *Liddell and Scott*, but in Hdt. IV, 181, we find only the latter form. Hippokrates, 890 A, has χλιαρῶς.[2]

ἰαρός does not occur in Ionic. On ἱερός and ἱρός see § 167.

ἕτερος = ἄτερος, Doric, Boiotian, Attic (in θἄτερον, but χἄτερος, Klein, *Vasen*, 124), though Attic has generally ἕτερος.[3] In Aiolic we have conflicting testimony; ἕτερος, Sappho, 106, and C. D. I. 2799_{9}, but Herodian, I, 507_{6}, opines that ἀτέρυι is Aiolic. ἕτερος is, morphologically considered, the later form, its initial ε being due to the influence of the ε of the following syllable. Schmidt (K. Z. XXV, 92, note, and 25, 43), a reference suggested by Dr. Collitz, explains in like manner ὀρρωδέω, and even ἔρσην and τέσσερες. Cf. also ἀττέλεβος, Hdt. IV, 172, for ἀττέλαβος.

NOTE. — Roberts, No. 167, contains τητέρηι (ΤΕΤΕΡΕΙ). Cf. Roberts, pp. 196, 200, 374. The inscription cannot be Elean, as Wilamowitz thinks,

[1] τέσσερα held its ground till late. Upon an Egyptian papyrus (189 A.D.) we find it still preserved. Cf. Trans. Berlin Acad. 1883, pp. 916, 919.

[2] In one instance we have -ελος for Attic -αλος, ὕελος, Hdt. III, 24. ὕελος was regarded by the grammarians as the Hellenic form. Bredow, p. 136, suggested that it was sanctioned by the authority of Theophrastos, who adopted it from Ionic.

[3] Attic inscriptions have always ἕτερος. Attic θἄτερον, *sic*, and not θάτερον. It is impossible that τὸ ἕτερον should become θάτερον, as is commonly stated.

Digitized by Google

since that dialect loves ᾱ in preference to η. Does not the absence of the *asper* indicate an Asiatic-Ionic origin? We find τὴτέρῃ in Phoinix in Athen. 495 E.

7. Other examples of Ionic E = A of other dialects.

ὅτε, πότε, ἄλλοτε, Ionic-Attic = Dor. ὅκα, πόκα, ἄλλοκα, = Aiolic ὅτα, πότα, ἄλλοτα. Both Ionic and Doric forms are equally original, an I.E. palatal sound becoming *tau* before ε, *kappa* before α. The Aiolic forms are contaminations.

On εἵνεκεν, εἶτεν, ἔπειτεν, see under Adverbs. -θεν, -θε are the Ionic forms. γέ Ionic-Attic = Doric γά, Epeirot. γέν.[1]

γέμμα was the Ionic form used especially by Demokritos according to the unsupported testimony of Eustathios, 370_{15}. For other variations between ε and α, α and ε, occurring in various dialects, and for which no satisfactory explanation has as yet been reached, compare G. Meyer, Gramm. § 24.

μέγαθος, ὑπερμεγάθης in Hdt., *e.g.* IV, 52, 191, μέγαθος in Anaxag. 1. Cf. Greg. Corinth. *d. d. I.* § 59. Attic μέγεθος, the variation between α and ε being due perhaps to the influence of ε in the initial syllable. The statement that the Doric dialect possessed the form μέγαθος is not beyond suspicion, since Philoxenos, who has the form with α in II, 19, either contradicts himself, V, 21, where he uses ὑπερμέγεθες, or at least shows that both forms were known to Doric. Lukian has μέγαθος, *S* 27, 30, according to Jacobitz, though *A* has the ε form everywhere. In Arrian, μέγεθος is the only reading in seven out of eleven cases, and this is the form used by Abydenos 5. Hippokrates and Aretaios both adopt the common form.

ε apparently takes the place of α in certain verbs in -εω (ὁρέω, τολμέω, οἰδέω, etc.) and before ο, ω, ου in inflection. A full list, with an attempted explanation of the interrelation of the forms, is given in the §§ treating of the verb.

Before the termination -(σ)αι, α becomes ε in Ionic by dissimilation; *e.g.* ἐπίστεαι, δύνεαι. See on the Ionic verb.

8. Ionic E = O of other dialects.

A singular substitution of ε for ο is found in Διενύσω(ι), Bechtel No. 31, from Amorgos, an inscription of the fifth century; whereas,

[1] γέν would seem to be the original form, but it is, perhaps, γε + ν(ε). Cf. Thessal. νε. γέ may be the Old Slav. *że*, Old Lith. *ge*; γά = Skt. *hi*, Lith. Pruss. *gi*, *ga* (Skt. *gha*).

Digitized by Google

the other Ionic inscriptions have either Διονύσιος or Δεονύς. See below on E and I. G. Meyer, Gramm. § 26, is inclined to regard this ε as parallel to that of Ἱππεδάμου (Rhodes) or of ἀνδρεφόνος, called Doric by Herodian, — forms of common speech with an ε comparable to the toneless *e* of Modern Greek. Bechtel's suggestion is preferable: Διένυσος : Διόνυσος = αἰέλουρος : αἰόλος, or as Lac. ὠμέσθιμ, R. M. XL, 8, : ὀμόσαι, or Herakl. ἐρρηγείας, etc., : Nom. in -ως. Cf. G. G. A. 1881. 1447, Baunack's *Stud.* I, 71, and K. Z. XXVI, 354. Solmsen, K. Z. XXIX, 89, offers no proof of his suggestion that Διενύσωι is an error.

Of the various names taking their rise from the two chief ablaut forms of Apollo (Ἀπόλλων Ἀπέλλων), there are a few examples upon Ionic soil of the latter, so common among Doric peoples. Ἀπελλίωνος, 153$_5$, Smyrna (names in Ἀπολλ-, lines 3, 15, 24, 37, 40, 41), Ἀπ]ελλῆς, 177 Chios, and in Erythraian inscriptions: Ἀπελλίου, 206 A 4 (cf. Ἀπόλλωνος, 206 A 20), Ἀπελλίου, 206 B 17 (in the same line, Ἀπολλών[ιος]), Ἀπελλικῶν, *Bull. de Corr. Hel.* III, 388. Also in Naukratis (Gardner's Naukr. I, pl. XXXII, 104), Ἀπολ- names are very frequent. In no case does the god bear the name Ἀπέλλων among Ionic peoples, though it is a form of as great antiquity as the usual Attic-Ionic one. See my paper Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc. XVIII, 97, and, above all, Prellwitz, B. B., IX, 327, ff. Baunack in the *Studia Nicolaitana*, p. 54, in his *Studien*, p. 155, and Meister *G. D.* II, 90 may also be consulted.

In ἑξαπέδου, Hdt. (II, 149) has preserved the older form of the termination; cf. Ψ 164, ἑκατόμπεδον (*Ven. A*), where the *vulgata* has -ποδον. In Attic (Thuk. and Xen.) the stem ποδ- has supplanted its rival πεδ.

Τερώναον, Terone 7 (before 420), cf. Τορωναῖοι on Attic tribute-lists in the first volume of C. I. A., and Τορωναῖος on an Attic mortuary stele, *Mitth.*, X, 367 ff.

The Mss. of Hdt. have ε for ο in -κόντερος, etc. Examples: πεντηκοντέρων, τριηκοντέροισι. In III, 41, 124, VI, 138, the Mss. vary; but in each case Stein has adopted the -κοντερος form. The Ionic form contains the simple form of the root ἐρ (ἐρέσσω ἐρέτης), whereas the Attic πεντηκόντορος, τριακόντορος have the ablaut ὀρ-. Both forms, τριακόντορος and τριακόντερος, occur in Attic inscr., and in the fourth century only; but the former is the more frequent. The ablaut form is the one to be expected from the composition of the word.

Digitized by Google

9. E in Ionic = I of other dialects.

Names derived from, or connected with, Διόνυσος exhibit a greater elasticity of vowel relations in Ionic than elsewhere.

We have above, § 8, met with the *sui generis* Διένυσος; besides this form we have Δεονῦς, 196, Maroneia, and Δεονῦδος, No. 198, Erythrai. The ε vowel we have also in Δεουνῦς[1] upon a coin of Imhoof-Blumer's collection (Bechtel, p. 114), in Δεύνυσος, Anakreon, 2_{11}, 11, (but Διόνυσε, 54, 55), and in the abbreviated ΔΕΟ on coin legends of Abdera, Bechtel, No. 163_1.

In sharp opposition to this ε are the forms with ι, which are very common. Examples are: Διόνυσος, Iasos, 104_{16}, Eryth., 206 B 24, and often elsewhere; Διονύσιος, Smyrna $153_{3,5}$, Thasos (L) 15 C 4, Kyzik. 111_5, Olbia 131_{14}, 261 (unc. locality), Halik. 241, Thasos (L) 19 B_4, 20 B 11; Διονυσᾶδος, Abdera, 163, 15, Coins of Brit. Mus., Thrace 66 nos. 62, 68, 85, and in almost every other Ionic quarter. Ionic is also Διώνυσος. On the probable connection with Ζεύς by folk's etymology, see Baunack (*Gortyn.* p. 67, note 1), and Solmsen, K. Z., XXIX 89. Cf. also *Frogs*, 215, Apoll., *Argon.*, II 905, IV 1132.

The corruption of antevocalic ε to ι, so frequent in Thessalian, Boiotian, Doric, Kyprian, etc., is rare in Ionic, if indeed it can be shown to exist at all. Καλλιμένιος 36 (Amorgos) is doubtless a mere slip on the part of the engraver. The nearest approach to ι is the pronunciation of ε as a semi-vowel in the synezesis εο. This semi-vocalic ε may disappear in contract verbs, as in Arkad. ἑλλαν]οδικόντων, 1257_{11}. Cf. νενοσσευμένα, Hdt. I, 159. Before ο, ε not unfrequently disappears in prose: Θόκλος, Styra, 19_{206}, Θοδ.ών 19_{378}, Κλόδεινος 19_{221}, Ἑτοκλέ[ης] 19_{15}. Cf. Megarian Θοκλείδα, Θοκλῆς, *Mitth.*, VIII, 189, 190. Fritsch's paper in Curt. *Stud.* VI (cf. esp. pp. 125–132), is scarcely trustworthy in all its dealings with Ionic. A reverse process has given us Θε- in Boiot., Θέσζοτος Θέδωρος, perhaps from Θεύδωρος.

10. E for H.

μέν for μήν in the formulae ἦ μέν, I, 196; μὴ μέν, I, 68, III, 66, V, 106; γε μέν, VI, 129, VII, 152, 234; ἀλλὰ-μέν, II, 20, 32, IV, 77, VII, 103; καὶ-μέν, IV, 45, VI, 98. Cf. Greg. Corinth., 471. Hdt. here adopts a usage common to Homer, and not unknown in Attic. Cobet, *Mis. Crit.*, 365, is an advocate of the view that Homer has

[1] For εου see § 144.

Digitized by Google

only ἢ μέν, μὴ μέν, not ἢ μήν, μὴ μήν. Cf. Monro, *Hom. Gram.*, § 345, and note, p. 322. With μέν I would connect the Thessalian, Homeric and Attic μά as κέν is connected with κά.

ἄπλετος is said by Bredow, p. 143, to be used by Hdt. for ἄπλητος = ἄπλᾱτος (πελάω). ἄπλητος occurs first in Hesiod, and then in the Hymn to Demeter; ἄπλετος is, however, to be classed with πλέως, and not with any derivative of πελάω. Cf. Siegismund in Curtius, *Stud.*, V, 201, 202.

ἐσσούμαι in Hdt., cf. Attic ἡττάομαι, out of which ἧττα was formed, Wackernagel, K. Z., XXX, 299. Hdt. has ἐσσοῦντο, I, 67; -μενος, I, 82; ἐσσωθείς, I, 207; ἐσσοῦσθαι, III, 22, etc. Brugmann conjectures (*Berichte d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* 1883, p. 193, cf. Osthoff *Perfect.*, 449) that ἐσσοῦμαι is from ἔτσων, whose ε represents a mechanical change of η (cf. ἧκα, Attic ἥττων) to ε, in order to bring the comparative into line with κρέσσων, Ionic for κρείσσων. Stein, however, has no qualms of conscience in writing ἥσσων (cf. ἥσσον, I, 98; ἥσσονες, V, 86, VIII, 113; ἡσσόνων, VII, 18; ἥσσοσι, VIII, 83) since he is supported in part by the unanimous voice of the Mss. Krüger holds to ἔτσων, *Formenlehre*, § 23, 4, 3.

Θαργελεός for Θαργη-, Chios, 174 C 18.

ἵλεος appears to be the Herodotean form, IV, 94, VI, 91. The interrelation of this form, which is also Kretan, with ἵληρος and ἵλλαος is a much-vexed question. ἵλεος represents that form which had η, the forms with α an old ablaut form ἰλᾰ-. Archilochos, 75_2, has ἵλαος (–⏑–) according to Bergk, for which Fick proposed without justification to accept ἵλεως. Cf. ἵλᾰος, Theognis, 782. ἵλᾰος is, however, Ionic as well as Attic (which has also ἵλᾱος). See Pischel, B. B. VII, 332 and Solmsen, K. Z., XXIX, 351. The Hesychian εἰλῆς εἶ · ἵλεως εἶ, has been read εἴλης εἶ, and explained as an Asiatic-Ionic perfect.

This word belongs also under the following section:

11. Ionic E = Â of other dialects.

1. In this category falls first Ionic -εων, — -ᾱων < -αιων or -αϝων.

ὀπάων, Hom. = ὀπέων, Hdt. IX, 50.

Ποτειδάϝων, Korinth., Ποσειδάων, Hom. = Ποσειδέων in Hdt., Ποσειδῶν, Arch. Ep., 114, for which we may read Ποσειδέων.

NOTE. — Ποσειδάων in the Ionic elegy is due to the pressure exercised upon the elegy by the epic. Cf. Theog., 692. In Archil., 10, Ποσειδάωνος ἄνακτος, as given by Bergk, is not supported by Ms. evidence, though corresponding to

Digitized by Google

Ποσειδάωνα ἄνακτα, Iliad, XV, 8. The objection that if Archil. may adopt -οιο from Homer, he has an equal right to -ᾱωνος is not cogent, since -οιο is an ancient Ionic termination, while -ᾱων cannot be shown to be the property of any period of the Ionic dialect. Fick's correction, Ποσειδήωνος, is based upon Ποσιδηών, Anakr., 6, Ποσειδέων, Archil., 114 νηός 4, παιήονα 76 (tetr.) (on the peculiar position of παιήων in Homer, see Fick, *Odyssee*, p. 17), and ἀλλήων, Naxos, 23, where ηω seems to be an intermediate stage between -ᾱων and -ων. Cf. § 29.

Ἀλκμάων, Hom. = Hdt. and Thuk. Ἀλκμέων. With Φιλέων in Φιλεωνίδ[ε]ος, Thasos, 73, cf. Hdt., VIII, 11, Φιλάων, which is, however, the name of a Kyprian. Μαχέων, Thas. (Louvre) 10_{11} = Hom. Μαχάων. Cf. Zacher, *Nomina in* -αιος, p. 112, Merzdorf, Curtius' *Stud.*, IX, 238.

2. Ionic genitives in -εω = ᾱ(ι)ο, Ἀτρείδεω, etc., see *Declension*.

3. Genitive pl. in -εων = -ᾱων (Boiot., Thessal. (-αουν), Hom.). Homer's gen. in -εων (H 1, φ 191) and -εων, -ῶν are Ionic. Menrad, p. 41, calls for the restoration of -εων and -εω wherever possible in the text of Homer.

4. λεώς = λαός, and in proper names: Hdt., Ἀρκεσίλεως, Χαρίλεως, Μενέλεως[1] (Μενέλαος, Hdt., IV, 169, of a λιμήν), and Ἀναξίλεως, Miletos, 93, not long after 600 B.C. So in λεωφόρον, Chios, 175, Λεωκράτης, Λεωμέδων, and many other forms on inscriptions. The Mss. of Hdt. are, of course, not consistent (cf. II, 124, V, 42). Even in the case of Doric names he occasionally uses the Ionic forms; *e.g.* Λεωπρέπης, VI, 85, but Λαοδάμας, Λαοδίκη, etc. The latter form is clearly a contamination of an original Λαοδίκᾱ and an Ionic Λεωδίκη. Variation in the proper names must be expected even upon inscriptions: thus we have, Chios, 177, Λεωσέβεο[ς], l. 3, but -τόλαος, l. 14. In the lyric poets the epic form prevails to some extent: λαός, Kall. I, 18, Xenoph., II, 15, whereas Hipponax (88) has preserved the only example of ληός, a form which shows that words with an ᾱ, represented in Ionic by ε, must have gone through a transitional period with η, though the examples are exceedingly few. Cf. *Eng. Journal of Philol.*, vols. IX, X, for a discussion as to the periods of Ionic.

With these compounds of λεώς and Ἀμφιάρεως[2] in Hdt., cf. the Homeric Πηνέλεως, Βριάρεως, etc. On λεώς, see also § 28, 30.

3. Furthermore, in Ionic ἕως, τέως[3] (ϊαϝω-ς τᾱϝω-ς), μετέωρος, νεός

[1] Greg. Corinth, pp. 42, 686.

[2] Cf. Greg. Corinth, p. 42. Ἀμφιάραου, Oropos, 18_2, a non-Ionic form.

[3] Bredow, p. 50.

Digitized by Google

(gen. of ναῦς), γεωπεδίον, etc., δίμνεως = διμναίους (Attic δίμνως), and in verbal forms, χρέωμαι, ἐξαναστέωμεν, ἐπιβέωμεν, μέμνεο, Hdt., V, 105, τεθνεός, I, 112, etc.

On θηέομαι = Attic θεᾶόμαι, see on the verb.

In almost every instance when primitive ᾱ was followed by a vowel, Ionic attests the presence of ε in place of ᾱ. The instances where this is not the case deserve to be brought out into clear light. ληός, in Hipponax, has already been referred to. In Hdt. we do not find νεώς, as might be expected, but νηός, the epic form = Aiolic ναῖος, well attested in literature and in inscriptions.[1] Herodotos' conservation of νηός is artificial and not in consonance with the genius of the Ionic dialect, which would call for νεώς, a form which in fact appears in composition: νεωποιήσαντες, Samos., 222. νεω- is the Hellenistic form, and as such is not foreign to Aiolic monuments; but it may be safely claimed as genuine Ionic, even though the Samian inscription is not old.

Whether the Ionic form of the adjective is ἵλεως, or ἵλεος, is still a matter of contention, since the ground form of the word has not been cleared up by the Lakonian ΘΙΛΕΓΟ (Roehl, 75, = Rob., I No. 261); and it is even a matter of uncertainty what is the genuine Homeric form, since Nauck has demanded ἵληος and ἵλεος in place of ἵλᾱος and ἵλᾰος. Stein's claim that ἵλεος is the Herodotean form is supported by the arguments of Wackernagel, *K. Z.*, XXVII, p. 264. See § 10.

On Ἀλκμέων, δίμνεως, see below under E = AI.

12. Ionic E = AI of other dialects.

Ionic γέη = epic γαῖα may be regarded as forms phonetically interdependent, though the parallelism of Ἀθηναία, adduced by Bechtel (*Ionische Inschr.*, No. 62), is faulty, since there is no *Ἀθηνέη We have, however, here to do with strong and weak case forms, as is shown on γῆ, under *Declension.*

A further example adduced as cogent is ἀγεόμενοι, Hdt., VIII, 69, though in Homer, υ 16, Hesiod, O. D. 333, and Archilochos, 25, the original αι cannot be impeached; nor does an *ἀγέομαι win the support of our sympathies when ἀγάσσεσθαι, etc., are compared. Fritsch (V. H. D, p. 39) is inclined to the view that ἀγεόμενοι can

[1] νηός is derived from a stem νᾱϝ-, ναῦος from a stem νᾰϝ-, both stems combining to form the declension. Cf. the intermixture of strong and weak stems in the case of ναῦς, νηῦς, "ship." The stem νᾰϝ- arose from the locative *νᾰϝεί.

Digitized by Google

have originated only in a period when αι was written ε (150 A.D. according to Meisterhans,[1] p. 27). Cf. παρακέεται, II, 130 (*C. P. d.*) for παρακαίεται.

If recourse to this means of accounting for the form ἀγε- be deemed too bold, we may be compelled to dissociate ἀγέομαι from ἀγαίομαι, and to class the former with such verbs as ἀρέομαι. Cf. Hesychios, ἄγη · παρ' Ἡροδότῳ βασκανία. We must withdraw beyond the realm of probability any suggestion that ἀγαίομαι was the ground form which, through ι passing into the glide and by an Ionic weakening of α to ε, became ἀγέομαι. Curtius, Verbum, I, 176, does not mention ἀγέομαι.

Ἀλκμέων, δίμνεως, are not to be derived from Ἀλκμάιων, etc. (Wackernagel, K. Z., XXVII, 267), but from Ἀλκμάων, etc. (Kretschmer, K. Z., XXIX, 416; Johansson, B. B., XV, 183).

13. Ionic E = EI of other dialects.

μέζων in Hdt. < μεγμων, a more original form than μείζων. μείζων is the poetical form (Theog., 338, 517), though μέζων appears upon a metrical inscription from Attika, *B. C. H.*, VIII, 470.[1] The form with ει has not been cleared up despite the efforts of Brugmann (*Ber. d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* 1883, p. 193, *Grundriss*, I § 639) and of Osthoff (*Jena Litteraturzeit.* 1878, Art. 476, *Zur Gesch. des Perf.*, 449) to refer it to the analogy of χείρων, ἀμείνων. Brugmann adopts the same explanation for κρείσσων for κρέσσων. Cf. also K. Z., XXIX, 140. μέζων has been imitated by Lukian, *Syr.*, 12, 19, 22, though μεῖζον 10 in all Mss.; in the *Astr.*, 5, 6, the ε form. In Arrian, μεζ- is well attested, but it is absent from the text of Euseb. Mynd. Eusebios, 3, has μέζον. Hippokrates and Aretaios adopt the Ionic form in a large majority of instances.

κρέσσων, formed from the strong base κρετ-, which does not elsewhere appear in Ionic, though well attested in the case of Arkado-Kyprian, and perhaps not foreign to Aiolic. κρέσσων occurs in Hdt., in Hipponax, 79, Anan., 3_3, Phokyl., 5_2, though in these poets the reading κρέσσων is disputed by some Mss. Theognis, 218, 618, 631, 996, has κρέσσων; which is sufficient authority to justify Renner's displacement of κρείσσων, 1074, 1173. I hold fast to my assertion (*Diphthong* EI, p. 58) despite the objections urged against it, *A. J. P.*, VIII, 98, that it is impossible for *yod* with *tau* to have become

[1] μέζων appears upon a Tegean inscription, *B. C. H.* XIII, 281.

Digitized by Google

σσ, and at the same time to have changed ε to ει in the preceding syllable. Hippokrates and Aretaios have κρέσσων, a form which recurs in Euseb. Mynd., 10, 62, though the Mss. of the Neo-Platonist has μείζων. In the letters of Hippokrates the Ionic form has been carefully imitated (17 22, 57, 27 :4).

εἰς, ἐς < ἔνς, see under *Prepositions.* The genuine Ionic form appears to be ἐς, though εἰς is not unknown. εἰς in Ionic contains a spurious, in Aiolic a genuine, diphthong.

κύπερος, an aromatic plant used by the Skythians for embalming, Hdt., IV, 71. Whether this is connected with the marsh plant, κύπειρον, Il., XXI, 351, is doubtful.

δέκνυμι (ἀποδεκνύντες, Chios, 174 B 14; δέξαι, δέξασθαι, δεχθῆναι, δεδέχθαι, ἀπόδεξις, in Hdt.; ἀπόδεξις, Euseb. Mynd. 25, but ἀναδειξάμενοι, 31) is to be separated from δείκνυμι, and compared with *doceo.*[1] The poets offer no example of δέκνυμι (δείξει, Solon, 10, ἔδειξε, Theog., 500). G. Meyer's suggestion (Gramm. § 115, note) that δειδέχαται is connected with *doceo* and δέξαι, etc., is scarcely to be accepted.

ἔργω = εἴργω (the distinction between εἴργω and εἴργω is late and fanciful). Hdt. uses ἔργω (ἀπεργμένον, ἀπέρξαι, κατέργοντες, etc., Bredow, p. 153), and not εἴργω[2] or ἐέργω. ἐξεῖργον, V, 22, is due apparently to the variable augment of ἔργω, and need therefore not be classed with κατειργνῦσι, IV, 69, ἀπείργουσα, IX, 68, where the Mss. unite in demanding a form stamped as un-Herodotean by all other passages. In Homer both εἴργω and ἐέργω are well established, hence a change of τῆλέ με εἴργουσι to τῆλέ μ' ἐέργουσι is not advisable.

NOTE. — I have tentatively explained the interrelation of εἴργω and ἐέργω as follows: εἴργω contains a prosthetic vowel that appears upon the weakening of the base Ϝεργ to Ϝιργ through influence of the accent. ἐέργω is perhaps a contaminated form, with the prosthetic vowel that is in place originally in the weak form above. Schulze, *K. Z.* XXIX, 235 protests against this explanation.

14. Varia.

The ε in ἐξαιθραπεύοντος, Mylasa, 248$_2$, is a prefix to help out ξ as representative of the Old Persian χš. Wiese, B. B., V, 90, sug-

[1] So far as I am aware no scholar has accepted the conclusions of Möller in regard to δείκνυμι, K. Z., XXIV, 462.

[2] Anan. 3, has καθείρξαι, a doubtful form. Theognis, 686, 710, 1180, has εἴργω, which I would not change with Renner.

Digitized by Google

gests that ἐξ- is due to a popular etymology which connected the word with the preposition. Cf. ἐξσατραπεύοντος, C. I. G., 2919, Tralles; ἐξσατράπης, Theopompos, Lobeck, *Ell.*, I, 144. A parallel example from Attic is Ἐξυπεταιών, C. I. A., III, 1119, for Ξυπεταιών, C. I. A., I, 243.

The vowel I (short ι).

15. Ionic I = E of other dialects.

E + σ + consonant + ι̯ becomes ι[1] in ἱστίη in the Ionic of Homer and of Hdt., as in other dialects. Cf. ϝιστίαν, Arkad., Ἰσστιαίε[ι]ος, Thessal., Ἰσστιαΐδας, Boiot. and Doric (Lokrian, Kretan, Syrakusan, Heraklean), Aiolic and Attic alone having preserved the ε vowel here. In Hdt. we find ἱστίαι, I, 176, Ἱστίης, II, 50, ἱστιητορίου, IV, 35, ἐπίστιος, I, 35, ἱστιῆσθαι, V, 20 (cf. the v. l.), ἱστίῃ VI, 86 (δ) for the ἑστίῃ of *L.* Greg. Corinth., p. 500, quotes ἐπίστιος. The editors of Hdt. have now removed all cases of εστ- from the text, even Ἱστιαιεύς having been substituted for Ἑστ-, though attested by Plutarch. Cf. the variation between Homeric Ἱστίαιαν and Apollodoros' Ἑστιαίαν.

In συνεστίῃ, VI, 128, the Mss. have -εστ-. For various conjectures, see Stein, *ad loc.* Bechtel *Thas.* (L), 18 B 10) writes Ἑ]στιαίου.

ε before σ + cons., when the latter is not followed by ι̯, does not become ι; *e.g.* εὐεσταῖ, Hdt., I, 85, ἀπεστοῖ, IX, 85.

NOTE. — A nominative ἰρής = ἐρής (Thessal.) is assumed by Baunack, K. Z., XXVII, 565; and for ἰρένες, ἰρέες is substituted by the same scholar in Hdt. IX, 85.

16. Ionic Ĭ = EI of other dialects.

See under Ī, § 65, for cases of itacism in Ionic. Sections 44, 46, will discuss the interrelation of -ιη and -ειη. No cogent instance can be adduced of an itacistic change of -ειη to -ΐη in any older period in the history of Ionic.

ἴκελος varies with εἴκελος in the Mss. of Hdt. as in those of Homer. I have shown in A. J. P., VI, p. 439, that the ι of the form ἴκελος is not descended from the ει of εἴκελος by the merging of ε + ι to ῑ, and by the weakening of this ῑ to ῐ. ἴκελος is = *(ε)ἰκελός (cf. ἀφ(ε)νείος). Stein has εἴκελος, III, 81, εἴκελα, VIII, 9, προσείκελα, III, 110, προσει-

[1] Cf. Collitz, A. J. P., VIII, 216, who suggests that the change is late. It is certainly confined to certain dialects.

Digitized by Google

κέλους, IV, 61, προσείκελος, IV, 177. The Et. Mag. 297_{28}, states that εἴκελος is the correct form, though ἴκελος often occurs; and that in composition the form with ι is alone admissible. This testimony is not authoritative for the fifth century. In Homer ῥίκελος occurs 17 times, while ῥείκελος has the v. l. ἴκελος 16 times. From the Mss. of Lukian we cannot learn what form the satirist used. Hippokrates, Aretaios, and Uranios prefer the ι form, which is doubtless to be adopted in the *Dea Syria*, 33, 40.

The existence of parallel forms in ει and ι in the name of Poseidon, and in names derived therefrom, does not substantiate the presence of itacism in this word. Hdt., VII, 115, has Ποσιδηίου, III, 91, Ποσιδηίου with Ποσειδηίου as *v. l.* The Ionic name of the Deity in Hdt. is Ποσειδέων (12 times). Cf. also Ποσειδωνιήτης, I, 167, and Ποσειδώνιος, I, 71, 85. On the Archilochean Ποσειδάων, see above, under E, § 11. Archilochos has Ποσειδῶν, or perhaps Ποσειδέων, ep. 114.

As regards the inscriptions, which speak with greatest authority in cases similar to this, their testimony is as follows: —

{ Ποσειδωνίο[υ], 153_{37}, Smyrna.	Ποσιδέου, 153_{32}, Smyrna.
{ " $131_{16, 17, 18}$, Olbia.	" 177_{17}, Chios.
	Ποσιδείου, Jahrb. für Phil. Suppl. Vol. V, 487, No. 47, and Vol. X, 29, No. 21.
Ποσείδειος, Thasos (Louvre), 10_{10}.	Ποσίδειος, 234 B 34, Perinthos.
	Ποσιδηίου, 196_{c}, Maroneia. Cf. the form in Hdt.
Ποσειδῶνος, 206 B 31, Eryth.	Ποσιδεῶνος, 206 A 46, Erythrai.
Ποσειδώνιος, $240_{25, 47}$, Halik.	
Ποσειδίππου, Thasos (Louvre) 2_{11}.	

The Attic month Ποσειδεών appears thus in the Ionic form, Ποσιδεών (Clodius, *Fasti Ionici*).

As regards the age of the inscriptions, the only inscription with ι, dating certainly before 400, is that from Maroneia, 196_{c}, the others with ι being later; while those with ει are not older than the bulk of those with ι. Chronological considerations do not therefore make in favor of the origin of the forms with ι from those with ει. Despite the obscurity which attends this word (cf. Prellwitz, B. B., IX, 331), it is evident that the variation between ει and ι, which is confined to no single dialect, must depend upon stem-gradation. On

Digitized by Google

this view the *ει* and *ι* stand in no immediate personal relation to each other.

The *ι* of Πισίστρατος, Samos, 225, does not necessitate the assumption of itacism, though its quantity is not certain. Cf. Πισίθεος in Delphic, Πισίας, Πισιδώρα, etc.

17. Varia.

1. *Iota* and *alpha* are not phonetically related; hence, Σινώπη and Σανάπη (Schol. Ap. Rh., II, 946) are not connected.

2. The form ὑγεῖα for ὑγίεια is found, Olbia, 129_{14} (imperial period). I do not discover any occurrence of ὑγῖα < ὑγίεια, or of ὑγίε(ι)α. ὑγίεια is the regular Attic form upon inscriptions. See 45 A.

THE VOWEL O.

18. Ionic O = A of other dialects.

On *α* = *ο* in forms in Ἄρτο-, ἀ̓ρρωδέω, etc., see above § 4, on ζόω § 69.

Examples of *ορ*, *ρο* = *αρ*, *ρα*, are very rare: Βροτάχου, 117 Pantikapaion and Ephesos (Wood's *Discoveries*, App. 2, No. 2). Hippokrates used βότραχος for βρόταχος, so we are informed; and βρόταχος is further supported by the Hesychian gloss (*s. v.*) and by the Et. Mag. 214_{43}, where the form is quoted from Xenophanes[1] and Aristophanes. The dialects of Lesbos, Boiotia, and Thessaly are generally held to evince a strong predilection in favor of the weak *ορ*, *ρο*, but Brugmann (*Grundriss*, I § 292) makes mention only of Lesbic and Boiot. forms. I have, however, shown A. P. A., XVIII, 104, 159, that it is inadvisable, if not futile, to attempt to set up such a restriction. Βρόταχος was the name of a Gortynian worthy of an epigram from the great Simonides (127), though the substitution of *ρο* for *ρα* is not elsewhere attested as a peculiarity of Kretan speech. At best βρόταχος can have been but partially adopted by Ionic. According to the express testimony of the scholiast on *Iliad*, Δ 243, Eustath. Il., $468_{.2}$, and Greg. Corinthius, 414, the Herodotean form was βάθρακος, a form not adopted by Stein (IV, 131, 132). Cf. Roscher in Curtius' *Studien*, IV, 189, whose etymological combinations are somewhat out of date, German *kröte* being the phonetic equivalent.

[1] Βρόταχος, τὸν βάτραχον Ἴωνες. Bergk.[4] does not register the word.

Digitized by Google

πορδακός, Sim. Amorg. 21 = Attic παρδακός. Archilochos (140) has, however, παρδακός.

The form Καλλίστροτο[ς] has been adduced from one of the Styraian lead tablets as proof of the influence of Boiotian vocalization upon the dialect of Styra. In Bechtel, No. 19_{210}, we read -στρΑτ clearly enough, Vischer's -στρΟ being incorrect. All other examples of the supposed interdependence of Boiotian and Styraian have in like manner been deprived of their validity upon more careful examination of the evidence. In Styra we have Στράτων 19_{416}.

The inscriptions offer several instances of a preference for the ο sound: —

Ὄστακος, Delos, 55 I., has been identified with ἀστακός, *lobster*. The form ὀστακός comes to light in Aristomenes, Γοητ., 2, and is quoted by Hesychios. It occurs also in Athenaios. Cf. Sturz, *de dialecto Mac. et Alexandr.*, p. 70, who held that ὀστακός was Alexandrian.

With Ko]μοσαρύη, Phanagoreia, 167 cf. Καμασαρύη, a queen of Bithynia, C. I. G., 2855. See Dittenberger, *Syll.* 104_1.

Ἑρμώνοσσα, Chios, 174 $A_{2,4}$, a locality in Chios. With this compare Ἑρμώνασσα, name of a woman and also of several cities.

19. Varia.

ἑουτῶν, Panionion, 144 (= C. I. G., 2909), an inscription but indifferently written.

ἐντοῦθα, Oropos, 18_{17}, whereas Sim. Amorg., 23, has ἐνταῦθα, Hdt. ἐνθαῦτα. This and the preceding example present no slight difficulties, since in no Greek dialect is there a well-attested instance of an interchange of αυ and ου. These forms may be rescued on the view that it shows the influence of other pronominal forms (οὗτος, ἐν τούτῳ). See § 124.

NOTE. — A variation between ᾱ and ο exists in the case of χαμᾶθεν, Hdt., II, 125, where *dz* have χαμόθεν, a form attacked by Cobet (*Varia. Lect.*, 89) and expelled by him from Kratinos, Xen. (*Hellen.*, VII, 2, 7), and Aristotle.

20. O in Ionic = E in other dialects.

Κυανοψιών, name of the month in Samos, Kyzikos (Reinach, *Traité*, p. 489), also Attic (*Berichte der Berl. Akad.*, 1859, p. 739). Cf. Πυανεψιών. See Schmidt's *Chronologie*, p. 458, Brugmann's *Gr. Gr.* p. 32 note.

Digitized by Google

The old ablaut of ϝεργ (-ϝοργ) occurs in Ἀθηνάης Ὀργάνης, Delos, 54. Cf. Hesychios, *s. v.* Ὀργάνη: ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ, ἣν καὶ Ἐργάνην ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων λέγουσιν. The same form of the name has come to light in Athens, Bull. dell. instit. di Corr. Arch. 1874, 107. Cf. ὄργανον, and later, ἔργανον with its ε from ἔργον. See § 162.

21. O in Ionic = OY of other dialects.

The Samian inscription, No. 220, has the new forms ἀλοργοῦς, l. 23, ἀλοργοῦν 22, 30, ἀλοργήν 15, 16, ἀλοργά 36, ἀλοργὰς 28, and παραλοργές 21; with which compare the Attic ἀλουργής and παναλουργέα, Xenophones, 3₃. ἀλοργός is from ἀλο(ε)ργός, Bechtel, *ad loc.*, Smyth, A. P. A., XVIII, 159. Cf. §§ 162, 179, on the contraction of O + E.

On the Ionic οὔνομα, μοῦνος, Οὔλυμπος, see under OY.

22. O in Ionic = OI of other dialects.

From Roehl, 501, = Roberts, 148 (Kyzikos), δεσπόνησιν = Attic δεσποίναις according to the commentators, we might conclude that Ionic ο was here = Attic οι. No such interrelation of ο and οι is known. It is possible that the ο is due to δεσπότης, etc.; but Osthoff's attempt to connect -ποινα and πότνια (*potnii̯a, *-ποτνι̯α, *-ποννι̯α, *-πονι̯α), which still awaits confirmation, does not provide us with the "fitting key" to explain the appearance of ο in a δεσπόνη.

On anaptyctic ι in Τροιζήνιος, see under OI, § 97.

23. Varia.

The assumption of hyphaeresis of ο in Hdt. βοηθός is rendered easier if we recall the Homeric ὄγδο̯ον, ξ 287. With βοηθός, cf. δορυξός, Πειριθός, etc. No dialectal dividing line can here be established. See G. Meyer, Gramm., § 152.

On the change of ο to υ in Euboian Ionic, see under Y. On the substitution of ο for the υ of αυ, ευ, see under these diphthongs.

Short Y.

24. Ionic Y = O of other dialects.

The change of O to Y is attested to a limited extent in Ionic: —

Upon a Kymaian inscription (Bechtel, 3 A = Roberts, 177 A) we find ΗΥΠΥ (ὑπύ) twice; from which it is clear that of the Ionians,

Digitized by Google

the Chalkidians[1] had not adopted the later *ü*. Other instances from Euboian Ionic of a similar retention of the I.E. phonetic value of *υ* as *u* do not stand on so sure a footing, though Wilamowitz, *Hom. Untersuch.*, p. 288, claims that the modern names *Kuma* and *Stura* are living witnesses to a pronunciation which held ground throughout the Ionic period of the epos, and in fact to the rise of Attic supremacy in Greece proper; while in Asia Minor *υ* had become *ü* before the year 500. The Styraian Μέτυικος, 19_{70}, may stand for Μέτοικος; but it is at best a doubtful form which has illegitimately been used to show the connection between Boiotian and Euboian Ionic.[2] No interrelation of O and Υ need be assumed on the score of Κεφαλότης, Styra, $19_{217, 218}$ (Κέφαλος $19_{212-217}$), or of Φιλύτης 19_{333}, since names in -ύτη, etc., are primitive. Cf. Φιλύτα, Kyrene, C. I. G., 5143, Φιλυτᾷ, Delos, C. I. G. 2310. Ὕλομπος, occurring in C. I. G. 8412, an apparently Ionic inscription, is of doubtful validity.

As regards the Ionic of the mainland, we have but slender support for the assumption that the old *υ* was retained. ῥυφεῖν, in Hipponax, 132, and ὑπέατι, Hdt., IV, 70, are the only examples from literature of the change of *ο* to *υ*. In Phokaia *υ* was pronounced as *u*, if we may judge from Ὑελητῶν 172_2, about 350 B.C. Hyele = Velia, the Oscan name being spelled with V, which the colonists reproduced by their Υ (Hdt., I, 167).

That *ο* became *υ* in αἰσυμνήτης, Teos, 156 B 4, is not proven. Cf. Chalkedon. αἰσιμνῶντες, C. I. G., 3794, with *ι* perhaps from *υ* as in Ἀστίμαχος, R. M., XXXV, 358. Cases of *ι* arising from an *υ*, which is itself from *ο*, are far to seek.

There is no change of *ο* to *υ* in ὄνυμα, found in Κλεώνυμος, Smyrna, 153_{19}, Ἑκατώνυμος, Eryth, 206 A 15, Κλειτώνυμος, Thasos (L.), 8_9, Πυθώνυμος, Thas. (L.) 10_{12} B. *υ* occurs in this word and its congeners in Aiolic, Boiot., Thessal., Phokian, Delphic, Aitolic, in Aigina and Selinus, and is pan-Hellenic in ἀνώνυμος and εὐώνυμος (Eph. 145). The extensive geographical reach of the forms with *υ*, and the undeviating writing ἀνώνυμος, render the assumption not improbable that the forms in *υ* are original, those in *ο* later. If the *ο* forms are original, there can be no doubt that the vowel interposed between the nasals was in a pre-historic period closed, the first *ο* remaining open.

On the substitution of *ο* for the *υ* of *αυ*, *ευ*, see under the head of these diphthongs.

[1] Κύμης τῆς ἐν Ὀπικίᾳ, Χαλκιδικῆς πόλεως, Thuk., VI, 4.

[2] Kyprian Στασίνικος Meister (G. D. II. p. 19) is not above suspicion.

Digitized by Google

25. Ionic Y = I of other dialects.

Συκεεῖσιν, on the stelè of Sigeion Bechtel, 103 = Roberts, 42 A 10. In the Attic part of the inscription we find Σιγευεῖσι. The υ is doubtless older since it is found on the epichoric document. The two forms are then interrelated as βυβλίον βιβλίον, Τυνδαριδᾶν Τινδαριδᾶν Roehl, 62 A, and Κυνδυῆς and Κινδυῆς on the Attic tribute lists. Iota does not pass into υ in any Greek word.

Hdt. has βύβλος, βύβλινος, βυβλίον. A complete mustering of the occurrences of these words in Stein's edition shows that the chief support of the forms with ι is derived from Mss. *P. R.*, while in one-seventh of all passages there is no variant. I conclude, therefore, that Bredow's distinction between βιβλίον, βίβλος (*notione charta scriptoriae, libelli*) and βύβλος (*notione libri conticis papyri*) must fall to the ground, and that the Ionic of the fifth century preferred, if it did not recognize exclusively, the forms with υ. The variants in favor of ι are due to the scribes rather than to the influence of such actual forms in ι as we find as early as 400 B.C. in Attic (C. I. A., II, Add., 1 B 25; Mitth., VII, 368, concerning the Attic cleruchs in Samos, 346 B.C.). The forms in ι continue in Attic inscriptions until the second century B.C., after which βυβλίον is the normal form. See Birt's *Buchwesen*, p. 12.

μόλυβδος, Hdt., I, 186, III, 56, has the variation μόλιβδος, a form that does not find any support in the Attic μολυβ[δῶν], C. I. A., II, 476_{43}, or in any other inscriptional form. That the ι form elsewhere forced an entrance at an early period should not mislead us as regards Ionic.

In a Halikarnassian inscription (Bechtel, No. 241) we read HMYΣK, which Bechtel transcribes ἥμ(ι)σ(υ). This is possible, though the occurrence of ἥμυσυ upon Attic inscriptions (C. I. A., II, 17_{45}) and elsewhere, *e.g.* Delos (B. C. H., II, 580), renders the attempt to rescue this form for Ionic not overbold. Cf. Meisterhans, p. 22, Blass, *Aussprache*,[3] p. 40. ἥμισυ occurs on a late inscription from Thasos, 72_{16}, upon one from Teos, 158_{24}, and in Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition*, III, 335. The forms in *iota* are the more primitive, those in *upsilon* being due to an assimilation which could take place in Greece only at a period when the inherited tendency to avoid a succession of υ's was no longer felt.[1]

[1] In Attic the iota held its ground in those forms which show no υ in the endings.

Digitized by Google

On αἰσυμνήτης see above § 24. Ionic here preserves the original υ in the Tean αἰσυμνήτης, 156 B 4; and it is to the influence of Ionic that is due αἰσυμνάτας in Cherson. Taur., whereas αἰσιμνάτας is the Megarian orthography (Selinus, Chalkedon, Selymbria). Bechtel, C. D. I., 3016, conjectures that the change between the weak vowels υ and ι ensues when ϝ originally proceeded the strong vowel (ἄϝετμα, ἀϋτμή, ἀΐσθω).

On a supposed change of α to υ, see above § 5.

The Long Vowels.

26. Â.

The three subdivisions of Ionic uniformly present Â in place of that H which is specifically Attic. An Ionic ᾱ in Homer, though supported by Brugmann, Gr. Gram., § 10, must be held to be indefensible. Nor on the other hand does the constitution of the Homeric poems permit us to assume that κᾱλός is Doric (King-Cookson, p. 184). See Bechtel, *Phil. Anzeiger*, 1886, 20 ff.

27. The dialect of Styra it has been alleged, offers instances of an original Hellenic Â, due to the influence of the speech of Boiotia. Names of Ionians may assume, it is true, a form inconsistent with the laws of Ionic, but this happens solely when a special reason exists. Compare for example the names of the children of Kimon, where political preferences have dictated a nomenclature alien to Attic. In all other cases it must be denied that Ionic can admit a thoroughgoing contamination of its phonetics from the influence of a neighboring speech centre. The examples from the lead tablets are worthy of registration. Cf. Bechtel, *Ion. Insch.*, p. 36.

Σκοπάνωρ 19_{306}, to be read Σκόπᾰνδρος.

-αντίδα[ς] 19_{160}, to be read Ἀντιᾶ[ρης].

Λυσαγόρας 19_{244}, an uncertain reading.

Λοκράτης 19_{391}, to be read Λ(ε)ωκράτης, since E and A are not infrequently confused in the tablets.

Χαρίλαος 19_{424}, to be read Χαρίλ(ε)ως.

Λοχᾱγός 19_{126} is based upon the Lakonian λοχᾱγός, which is in Attic, too, a loan form. Hdt. uses λοχηγέω($\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}\gamma}$).

Ἐσνέας 19_{191} is no name at all, which may be said of Lenormant's Εἰνέας. In Roberts, 189 F, upon a vase from a colony of Chalkis,

Digitized by Google

we read Αἰνέης, and upon a Thasian inscription in the Louvre (3_{5}), Αἰνησίης. Bechtel, 12, has Αἰνεητῶν, from Ainea.

Δᾱμάρετος, cited by Karsten, p. 18, is in reality Δημάρητος, and is so read by Bechtel, 19_{180}.

Ηγγαμονεύς 19_{200} is read by Bechtel Ηγγεμονεύς. This and Δαμάρετος are due to Lenormant.

28. The retention of ᾱ in Hdt. occurs in the names of non-Ionic personages, which are of Doric stock. As Gramm. Meerm. states (649): τὰ εἰς ᾱς λήγοντα ὀνόματα, ἐὰν μὴ ὦσι Δωρικά, εἰς ῆς τρέπουσιν (Ἴωνες), a statement which must not be twisted so as to give life to a Doric κᾱλός in Homer. The following are instances of proper names with ᾱ in Hdt.: —

Ἄγις, VI, 65, the Spartan. It is noticeable that Hdt. uses the Ionic form of the adj. Σπαρτιήτης. Cf. Ἡγησίλεως, VII, 204.

Ἀέροπος, VIII, 137, an Argive, VIII, 139, a Makedonian; but Ἠέροπος, IX, 26, a Tegean.

Ἀκαρνάν, I, 62; Ἀκαρνανίη, II, 10.

Ἀπιδανός, the Thessalian river, VII, 129; but Ἠπιδανός, VII, 196.

Ἀρίσβα, I, 151, a city in the Troad = Ἀρίσβη, B 836. The proper form may, however, be Ἄρισβα; so Strabo, XIV, 635. Eustathios distinguishes between two cities, Ἀρίσβη and Ἀρίσβα.

Ἀριστέας, VII, 137, a Korinthian. Cf. Ἀριστέης, IV, 13, from Prokonnesos.

Γυγάδας χρυσός, I, 14. This apparently irregular form (Γύγης elsewhere) is explained by the statement of the historian: ὑπὸ Δελφῶν καλέεται Γυγάδας ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀναθέντος ἐπωνυμίην.

Δυμανᾶται, V, 68, a Doric tribe.

Κρᾶθις, I, 145, a river in Achaia and also a river near Sybaris, V, 45.

Names in -λαος. Μενέλαος of a λιμήν, IV, 169, and Μενελάου, VII, 169; Ἀρχέλαοι, V, 68; Λαοδάμας, a Phokaian, IV, 138, an Aiginetan, IV, 152. Hdt., however, is not consistent in writing Νικόλεως, VII, 134, and Νικόλας, VII, 137, though a Spartan is referred to. Furthermore, we have Λακρίνης, a Lakedaimonian, I, 152; Λαφάνης, an Arkadian, VI, 127; Λαδίκη, a woman of Kyrene, II, 181.

Cf. the forms of λαός § 11, 30. A perfect dichotomy of the dialects as regards names in -λαος is clearly impossible, in view of the fact that even Attic citizens before the year 500 B.C. bear names formed from this form of the word, the right to use Λεώς having been confined to the tribe *Leontis*. That -λαος was also in use among the Ionians is

Digitized by Google

clear from its occurrence upon a Chian inscription, 177_{14}, -τόλαος, l. 14 (Λεωσέβεο[ς] in l. 3).

Ὀρνεᾶται, VII, 73.

Παρωρεᾶται, IV, 148, but VIII, 73, Παρωρεῆται.

Προναίη, I, 92. Cf. also Προνηίη.

Τιθορέα, VIII, 32, a peak of Parnassos.

Ὑᾶται, V, 68, from Sikyon.

Φιλάονα, VIII, 11, despite -αων generally becomes -εων in Hdt. Cf. Μαχάων in Homer = Μαχέων, Thasos (Louvre), 10_{11}. Cf. Φιλεωνίδ[ε]ος, Thasos, 73. Hdt. has ὀπάων, V, 111.

Χαράδρα, in Phokis, VIII, 33. So Stein, Bredow Χαράδρην. So also, χαράδραν, IX, 102. Cf. § 3.

Χοιρεᾶται, V, 68, from Sikyon.

Besides these names we have several which show -ᾱς in the nominative case preceded by a consonant (Ἀριάντας, Σίκας, Αὔρας, Δύρας) which are inflected -α, -ᾳ, -αν. Proper names in -εης and -ιης are the rule, with but few exceptions (Ἀριστέας, VII, 117).

Herodotos' treatment of the names of non-Ionic persons and places is tolerably elective. In a considerable number of instances where we might expect a thoroughgoing Dorization he surprises us by such Ionisms as: —

Λεωνίδης, Λεωβάτης, Λευτυχίδης (a form that occurs in Timokreon, 1_2). Μενέλεως he occasionally uses despite Μενελάου, VII, 169. By a reverse process we have Ἀριστολαΐδεω, I, 59, an Athenian.

Again, the island is called Θήρη, its founder, Θήρας. The leader of the colony never occurs in any writer in the form Θήρης. Ἀζήν, VI, 127, is the inhabitant of the Arkadian Ἀζανία; Ἐνιῆνες, VII, 132, etc., despite the frequent names in -ᾶνες; Τεγέη, Σικελίην, Σικανίην, VII, 170.

29. Retention of ᾱ in proper names occurring outside of Herodotos. In poetry, see on Ποσειδάων, under the vowel E, § 11.

Upon a Halikarnassian inscription, 240_{23}, we read Ἰάσονος; Ἀετίωνος, Iasos, 104_{16}, Ποιᾱσσίων, Keos, 47_2, Ποιᾶσσαν 47_{11}. Cf. Ποιήσσιοι, Ditt., *Syll.*, 63_{82}, time of the second maritime league; Δημαινέτης, Amorg., 29, but Εὐθύδαμος, Klazom. Le Bas, *Voy. Archéol.*, III, 1, No. 186. Ναΐς, Roberts, 190, II F, Χώρα 190, I K, Γαρυφόνης 191, on Chalkidian vases. See K. Z., XXIX, 390.

NOTE. — The usage of Attic prose inscriptions may here be noted. In the fifth century we find both the epichoric and the Attic names of tributary states (Hermes, V, 52). In the fourth century the tendency to permit the adoption of the epichoric name seems to be stronger.

Digitized by Google

30. Â < ᾱϝ.

λᾱός < *λᾱϝος.

Homer has λᾱός, λᾱοσσόος, and in proper names Λᾱοδάμεια, etc.; λεώς in Ἀγέλεως and Πηνέλεως[1]; and ληός, incorrectly transcribed in Λειώκριτος (Ληόκριτος) and Λειώδης (Ληώδης < λᾱϝο + ϝαδης). Of these, the first form has found an echo in Ionic poetry: Archil., Χαρίλαε, 79 (paroemiacus and ithyphallicus, Flach, Gr. Lyrik, p. 228). The reading is not perfectly certain, Aelian having Χαρίδαν. Cf. Χαριδαντίδης, a Thasian name, Bechtel's *Thas. Inschr.*, p. 8. Ἰόλαος 119_3 (a hymn of uncertain metrical reconstruction);[2] Kallinos, λαῷ 11_8; Tyrt., λαόν 11_{13}, λαούς 12_{21}; Xenoph., λαοῖσι 2_{15}; Theog., λαοί 53, 776, λαοφθόρον 781. These forms are not Ionic.[3] Genuine Ionic is ληός, the oldest Ionic form of the word known to us, preserved in Hipponax, 88, and in Hdt., λήϊτον, VII, 197 (λήϊτον καλέουσι τὸ προτανήϊον οἱ Ἀχαιοί).[4] Cf. Λήϊτος in Homer, XIII, 91, and Pott, K. Z., VII, 324. With ληός, cf. νηός in Hdt. and παιήονα, Archil., 76.

This ληός became λεώς in later Ionic; in Miletos, at least, shortly after the year 600 B.C. (Ἀναξίλεως, Becht., No. 93). λεώς is the form in Hdt., though we find ληός, V, 42, λαόν, IV, 148, which Stein refuses to accept. λαοφόρων, I, 187, exists parallel to λεωσφέτερον, IX, 33, though the testimony is so greatly on the side of λεώς that a fair view will not regard harshly the attempt to make Herodotos uniform in his adoption of this form.

When ϝ disappeared after ᾰ, its disappearance was not signalized by the lengthening of the vowel (ἀείνᾰος, Hdt., I, 93, 145; Attic νᾶω = Aiolic ναύω). Hence, when in Ionic ᾱ appears, it is clear that we must distinguish between such poetical forms as ἀείσω, Theog., 4, cf. Od., 17, 519, and such prose forms as Ἀΐδης. In Ionic poetry the short α appears in Ἀΐδαο, Theog., 244, 427, 906, Ἀΐδεω 703, 726, 802, 1014, 1124, Solon 24_8; Ἀΐδην, Tyrt., 12_{38} = Mimn. 2_{14}. Ἄϊδος, Theog., 914, has ᾱ.

In but two iambic passages (Simon. Amorg. 1_{14}, 7_{117}) do we find traces of Ἀΐδης. In both passages the ᾱ falls under the ictus, a fact which seems to suggest the Homeric usage, which is as follows: Ἄϊδος

[1] See K. Z., XXVII, 266.

[2] Ἰόλαος, Acharn., 867, Eurip. uses both Ἰόλαος and Ἰόλεως. Ἰόλαος on a vase (Klein, *Vasen*,[2] 206, 1), which shows mixed dialect (Ἰόλαος Μανία by the side of Μεγάρη Ἀλκμήνη). Cf. K. Z., XXIX, 400.

[3] This is not disputed by the Chian, -τολαος 177_{14}, as has been shown, § 11. It is noteworthy that λαός does not occur in the iambics of Archilochos.

[4] Et. Mag. 562_{53}.

Digitized by Google

(Iliad nine times, Od. four times), elsewhere ᾰ (so Ἀΐδης, V 395, IX 158, etc.).

Hesiod always has ᾰ, and the Homeric Hymns, except in one passage, IV, 348, where Ἅιδη is read by Gemoll. Hdt. has Ἀΐδης. In Aiolic and Doric the α is invariably short. So, too, in words derived from the same base. See § 142.

It has been widely held that Ἀΐδης is derived from α + ϝιδ-, and that the passages in Homer where the α is long, represent αυ, ϝ having been vocalized. There is no objection to this explanation, so far as it goes. The difficulty lies in the Attic Ἅιδης (ἅδης), which cannot have arisen either from ἄϝιδ- or ᾱϝιδ-. Since the Attic and Homeric forms cannot be dissociated, it is best to regard each as descended from αἰϝιδ- (cf. κᾱ́ω, ἀεί). This of course necessitates the abandonment of the old-time etymology whereby Ἀΐδης is the *unseen* god. αιϝιδ- may be connected with αἰεί or with αἶα. See Wackernagel, K. Z., XXVII, 276. On this view Ἄϊδος is the older, Ἄϊδος the younger, form; and the apparently isolated cases in Simonides Amorg., are brought into line.

31. Ᾱ < ᾰνς.

πᾶσα < *πάντι̯α may serve to illustrate the existence of that ᾱ in Ionic-Attic which did not suffer the change to η at the time when *πάντι̯α became πᾶσα. When there arose the tendency to substitute a lighter form for the disyllabic *πάντι̯α, or to expel ν before *sigma* (whether proethnic or from τι̯), the law according to which ᾱ has become η in Ionic had ceased to exist, having extended its operations throughout the length and breadth of the dialect. A πῆσα or τῆς for τᾱ́νς was thus rendered impossible. So, too, with names in -δάμᾱς.

In this connection it is noteworthy that Kallinos, I_{16}, has ἔμπᾱς, whereas Homer has ἔμπης; forms not to be derived immediately from πᾶς, despite ἔνπασι, adj., C. I. G., I, 1625_{50}. The latter form does not occur outside of the epic. Brugmann, Gr. Gr., p. 225, connects -πᾱ- with κυέω through κυ̯-ᾱ-, and thus regards ἔμπᾱς either as a genitive or as a petrified instrumental with the *sigma* of ablative adverbs. This -πᾱ- does not seem to be associated with Kyprian παι. I know of no other case where *sigma* has attached itself to an instrumental. ἔμπης in Homer should be reflected by ἔμπης in Kallinos, as I am aware of no reason for expelling the Homeric form in favor of the Aiolo-Doric (or Attic) ἔμπᾱς.

Digitized by Google

32. Â < ανϝ.

Ion. φθἀνω = Attic φθἀνω.

33. Â *in the forms of the Comparative degree.*

μᾶλλον, for which one might expect *μῆλλον, if the form with λλ was formed before or during the period in which proethnic Â became H in Ionic-Attic. The force of analogy has, however, substituted for the old comparative *μέλλον (melius) the form μᾶλλον, which arose at a period when ᾱ no longer became η in Ionic-Attic. The proportions τάχα, τάχιστα : θᾶσσων and ἐλάχιστα : ἐλᾶσσων might have given us first μᾰλλον, then μᾶλλον for μᾰλιον. The difficulty, which is not recognized by King-Cookson, p. 364,[1] is that θᾶσσων and ἐλᾶσσων are themselves associative forms, whose priority to μᾶλλον is not made out on other grounds than the desirability of using them to account for μᾶλλον. μᾰλιον, Tyrt., 12_6, is hysterogenous, due to the parallelism of ἥδιον : ἥδιστα ; so μᾰλιον : μᾰλιστα. Cf. Choirob., Orthog., 248, where for μάλιον, Harder, *De alpha vocali apud Homerum producta*, p. 104, would read μάλλον (*sic*).[2]

θᾶσσων, Attic θᾶττων, with ᾱ according to Herodian, I, 523, II, 13_{12}, 942_{17}, from *θάγχιων for *θέγχιων with α through influence of τάχα, τάχιστος. The nasal before σσ disappears, leaving compensatory lengthening.

ἐλᾶσσων < *ἐλάγχιων for *ἐλέγχιων cf. ἐλέγχιστος. Cf. Schmidt, K. Z., XXV, 156.

*μέλιων, θέγχιων, ἐλέγχιων are displaced forms which existed at a period when I.E. Â was changed to Ionic η. Their displacement by the ᾱ forms was therefore subsequent to the production of Ionic η.

34. Â in other words.

κᾱλος : *καλιος = Skt. kalya- would become κᾰλλός in Greek, which by reduction of the geminated liquid should appear as *κηλός in Ionic, as κᾱλός in Doric. Now in Homer we find κᾱλός without exception, a form that cannot, however, be regarded as Doric. In Hesiod κᾱλός prevails · in Theog., 585, W. D., 63, καλός. In the lyric poets we find κᾱλός in the following passages: Kallinos, 2_3;

[1] Following Osthoff, *Perfectum*, 450.

[2] The schol. Il., VIII, 353, brings forward a μάλλιον, which Eustathios calls Doric.

Digitized by Google

Tyrtaios, 4_{7}, 10_{1}, 10_{30}*; Mimnermos, 5_{3}, 11_{4}; Archilochos, 21_{3}, 29_{2}, 77_{1}; Simon. Amorg., 7_{51}, 7_{87}; Theognis, 16, 242, 257*, 609, 683, 1019, 1047, 1106, 1216, 1251, 1329, 1336, 1350*, 1369* *bis*, 1377; Solon, 13_{24}, 13_{40}*; Phokyl., 13_{2}; Anakreon, 22, 63_{10}, 71; Oracle in Hdt., I, 66*; cf. also Sim. Keos, 147_{4}. On the other hand κᾰλός appears as follows: Mimn., 1_{6}; Solon, 13_{21}; Theog., 17 *bis*, 282, 652, 696, 960, 994, 1259, 1280, 1282; Ananios, 5_{2}; Sim. Am. 7_{67} (?); Anakr. 71 (?); Sim. Keos, 147_{4}, 156_{1}. Passages marked with a * have the α in the arsis.

If we question the other dialects outside of Attic, we learn that κᾰλός is the prevailing form: Terpander, 6_{2}; Alkman, 35; Sappho, 1_{9}, 3, 11_{2}, 14_{1}, 19_{2}, 28, 58, $101_{1.2}$, 104; Praxilla, 5_{1}. Alkman has κάλλα = καλῶς 98, Alkaios, κᾰ́λιον 134, Sappho, κᾰ́λιστ' 104_{2}, if Bergk's conjecture be admitted. In the "universal melic" of Simonides of Keos we have κᾰλός 5_{7}, 37_{12}, 40_{2}, 70, in Bacchylides, 1_{1}, 25. In the Attic drama we find both forms, κᾱλός being the rarer form. The lyric poets have κᾰλός: Ion, 1_{15}; Kritias, 1_{14}, 2_{19}; and in the Skolia, $19_{1,2}$, $20_{1,2}$. Plato (?) has κᾱλός 8; Aischrio, 1, 4_{2}, the same form. κᾰλός occurs upon an epigram from Delcs, 53.

If, as is held, the reduction of the geminated liquid affords an opportunity for a compensatory lengthening of the vowel preceding λλ (στήλη < στάλλᾱ, ἧλος < ϝάλλος in Hesychios' γάλλοι, κρήνη < κράννᾱ), this reduction would produce *κηλός in Ionic. Those who demur to the form κᾱλός in Homer have recourse to the easy expedient of regarding this form as an incorrect transcription of ΚΑΛΟΣ, which they would read καλλός. But have we the right to assume with G. Meyer (*Gramm.*[2] § 65) that wherever κᾱλός is found in the Ionic iambic and elegiac poets this form is incorrect? Cf. Schmidt, *Neutr.* p. 47.

φᾱρος in Herodotos as in Homer, if φάρος is not to be read with Nauck. So, too, in Xenophanes, 3_{3}. See Harder, *de alpha vocali*, p. 92 ff.

καρᾱδοκέω in Hdt., who, however, has τρικάρηνος; κάρᾱ < καρᾱσα.

ἐᾱ́σω in Hdt. = Skt. sāvayati, Lat. desivare. ἐᾱ́ω is originally an aorist formation, pres. *sévō*, aor. *sevᾱ̆-* (σεϝᾱ̆-ιω).

ἰθᾱγένης, Hdt., II, 17 = epic ἰθαιγένης locative (Curt. *Stud.* VI, 384). Rutherford, *Phrynichus*, p. 15, classes the ἰθαγένης of Aischylos among the old Ionisms of the Attic dialect. See on ἤν and ἐάν under *Conjunctions*.

ἀνᾱ́λωμα, Thasos, 72_{1}, ἀνᾱ́λωσιν, Theog., 903. Cf. ἀνήλωμα, C. I. G.,

Digitized by Google

2347, c. 61, 3137_{58} = Ditt. *Syll.*, 171_{58} (Smyrna), which owe their η to verbal influence. η is here not original. Even the perfect indic. and the participle have this loan η.

ἀθανάτων, Kall., 1_{13}, Tyrt. 12_{32}, Sol. 4_{2}, $13_{64.74}$, Theog. very often. παῖδ' Ἄρεω, Archil., 48,[1] probably with ᾱ; cf. also Tyrt., 11_{7}. The regular Ionic η would have disfigured these words. The lyric poets have ᾰ, except Bacchyl., 36_{2}. Another poetical form is: —

ἀνήρ, Xenoph., 6_{4}, Phokyl., 15_{7}, Demod., 3, Solon, 13_{39} (?). Elsewhere ᾰ. No form in η (cf. ἠνορέη) is found.

λᾱρινοῦ, Xenophanes, 5_{2}, as λᾱρός in Homer from *λασερός.

κιχάνει, Archil., 54_{3} (troch. tetr.), as in Homer, from *κιχάνϝω = Attic κιχάνω.

φάρμᾱκος, Hipponax, 5_{2}, 6, 7, 8_{2}, 9, 37_{3}, but φάρμᾰκον, 43_{4} (= Attic φάρμᾰκον). The Ionic word is not accented differently from the Attic, according to Bergk. Ion. φάρμᾱκος = *φάρμακϝος = φάρμακ(κ)ος.

χαμᾶθεν is rejected by Blass, *Aussprache*,[3] p. 116, in favor of χαμαῖθεν or χαμᾷθεν. Cf. Osthoff, *Perfect.*, p. 597. The Mss. do not have χαμᾶθεν, II, 125, where χαμάθεν is found beside χαμόθεν; and in IV, 172, we have no authority for Stein's χαμᾶθεν.

The Mss. often mix Ionic η with Attic ᾱ after a fashion that gives a false conception of the original dialect preferences of the poets; *e.g.*, Archil., γραῦς, Ananios, ἀνθίας.

NOTE. — Names in -ᾶς (Const. Decl.) are not contracted from -εας, but represent, originally at least, the lengthening of the short final α of the first member of a compound name, *e.g.* Ἀλκᾶς from Ἀλκαμένης; or from the lengthening of the initial ᾰ of the second member, *e.g.* Μολπᾶς (Μολπᾶδος, 163_{10}, Abdera) from Μολπ-ᾰγόρας. Later on these forms were created *ad libitum*. See Bechtel on No. 76, p. 60. Ionic and Attic are here parallel: cf. Ἀλκᾶς, C.I.A., I, 433, which cannot have originated from Ἀλκέας; Ionic Μολπᾶς, Νοσσικᾶς, Ἡρᾶς, Θευδᾶς, etc. See § 36.

35. H. Preliminary Remarks.

Pronunciation of η. In the alphabet of Keos, Naxos, and probably Amorgos, Ionic-Attic η = ᾱ of Aiolic, Thessalian, Boiotian, North-Greek, Arcado-Kyprian, Doric, or = ε + α, is represented by Ⱶ or H (later); pan-Hellenic η by E. From this it is clear that the difference in graphical representation reflects a qualitative difference in pronunciation, η = ᾱ or ε + α, being the open ē, η = I.E. ē, the closed long vowel.

[1] Eustath., 518_{22}. ὅθεν κατ' Ἰάδα διάλεκτον ἐπεκτείνας Ἀρχίλοχος.

Digitized by Google

Examples are:

Keos.
θυH, Rob., 32 A.
Amorgos.
μνHμα, Rob., 158 D.
Naxos.
ΔεινοδίκΘο, Roberts, 25.
ἀλΘον, Roberts, 25.
ΝικάνδρΘ, Roberts, 25.
ἐκΘβόλωι, Roberts, 25 and 26 A; cf. also Delos, 24 A.

Keos.
ἐπιβλΕματι, Rob., 32 A.
Amorgos.
wanting.
Naxos.
ἀνέθΕκεν, Rob., 25, 26 A.
κασιγνΕτΘ, Rob., 25.

This accurate distinction is, however, not carried throughout the entire history of the dialect; and in fact, before the adoption of the Ionic alphabet at Athens we find instances of a confusion between the two E sounds. Thus in Naxos ἐποίΗσΕν, Rob., 28, in Keos, Rob., 32 A, l. 17, we have διαρανθΗι, l. 23, θανΗι, where we should expect the closed ē sound to be represented by E, not H. Cf. Dittenberger, *Hermes*, XV, 229, Blass, *Aussprache*,[3] p. 24 ff., Roberts, § 33, and on 32 A, the authorities there quoted, and Karsten, p. 23.

A knowledge of the character of the η sound in Ionic is important, since Merzdorf, in Curtius' Studien, IX, 202 ff., has endeavored to establish the principle that open ē < ā + o becomes εω (ληός, λεώς), whereas closed ē (= I.E. ē) + o becomes εο (βασιλῆος, βασιλέος). Opposed to this doctrine is the Chian πόλεως (Becht. 174 A, 13), a form that must be held to be genuine Ionic. See declension of *Iota* stems, where the other occurrences of this form are registered. Furthermore, Ἄρεω, Archil., 48, is as cogent an objection to the law of Merzdorf as is πόλεως. And ηϝο from pro-Hellenic āvo does not become εω in later Ionic with consistency; as witness Ionic πλέος, χρέος and Hdt. νηός beside λεώς. Cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* § 19.

36. *Pan-Hellenic η appears invariably as η in Ionic.* The form χρᾶσθαι in Herodotos, and even in Attic (*Mitth.*, IX, 289, l. 24), is no exception to this law. That the root of this verb is χρη- (*χρηιομαι) is elevated beyond a doubt by the forms of the Kretan, Aitolian, Lokrian and Megarian dialects. A weaker form of χρη- is χρᾰ- (cf. κτη-, κτᾰ-ομαι), and it is this that appears in the Herodotean χρᾶσθαι, and perhaps in Attic χρῶμαι, χρώμενος, and Messenian χρῶνται, χρωμένους. *χραιομαι is then the base of this form. A second form of χρη- is χρε-, found in χρέομαι (Hdt., Heraklea, Rhodes, Krete, Delphi,

Digitized by Google

etc.). A fourth form is χρηέομαι, in Boiot. χρειεῖσθη, Megarian (Chalkik.) χρηείσθω, and Elean χρῆσται. Cf. Ahrens, II, 131; Meister, I, 70, 226, 297; Brugmann, M. U., I, 64; Merzdorf, C. S., VIII, 203, 209 ff., IX, 230, 236; Johansson, D.V.C., 155 ff. See § 131.

Attention may here be called to that η, which is produced by the lengthening of ε, the initial vowel of a word which stands second in a compound. This initial vowel may or may not be lengthened in the same dialect upon composition taking place. Cf. Chios, 174 C 25, ἀνηρίθεντος with ἀνερίθεντος (Homeric ἔριθος); also Ξενήρετος, Keos, 42, not from ἀρετή despite the later Ξενάρετος, C.I.G., IV, 8578, 108, 109 (Archil., ἐρέω, 25, 68). But see Wackernagel's *Dehnungsgesetz*, p. 41.

37. *Relation of η to ει.* The non-diphthongal EI is generally expressed by E upon Ionic inscriptions (see below under EI). Ionic η = (1) pan-Hellenic η and (2) ᾱ of other dialects, stands in no relation to this non-diphthongal ει in Ionic; nor is any change of η to diphthongal ει to be admitted. The form Κτεισίων, Styra, 19_{13c}, was asserted by me (*Diphthong* EI, p. 80) to be an impossible form. The same is held to be the case by Bechtel, *ad loc.*[1] 19_{1b} was read by Vischer Θείσων, and held to be the "Boioto-Aiolic" form for Θήσων. This is incorrect as regards the presence of a Boiotian form upon the Styraian leaden tablets. Nor can it be justified on other grounds. Bechtel suggests Ἀλ]θήσων; cf. Ἀλθημένης, a Thasiotic name.

38. Ionic H = Â of other dialects. I.E. ᾱ is represented in Ionic regularly by η.

παμπήδην, Theog., 615, with which cf. Solon's πεπᾶσθαι (13_7). This verb is, however, not in use in Ionic, which has accepted κτάομαι. Theog., 146, has, however, πᾱσάμενος. Schmidt, *Neutra*, p. 411.

On Πολυπάμων in Homer, cf. Fick, Odyss., p. 17; Wilamowitz, Hom. Unters., 70; G. Meyer, *Gramm.*, § 65; Johansson, D. V. C., p. 150. A Thessalian has the name Παμε[ν]ός, from *πᾱμαι.

ἥκη, Archil. tr., 43, the only instance in Greek of the ᾱ of this root. Cf. Skt. āçus, Lat. ācer. Weak form in ἀκόνη, ἄκων, etc.

ἠέρος, ἠέρι in Hdt. with the pseudo-Ionic nominative ἠήρ in Hipp. ΠΑ 6, 10, 22, 26, Aretaios, 260; ἠέρος in Lukian, Hippokr.

[1] Cf. Κτησίων $19_{58\text{-}60,\ 234\text{-}236,\ 386}$, Κτήσιμος 19_{57}, Κτῆσις 19_{122}, Κτηρῖνος 19_{438}, Κτησῖνος $19_{232\text{-}236}$. The ᾰ of κτάομαι is ablaut of κτη-. Boiot. Κτεισία-, C. D. I., 483 = Κτησίου.

Digitized by Google

ep., Aretaios; ἠέρι, Hippokr. Aret.; ἠέρα, Hippokr. Aret.; ἠερίων, Luk., *de Astr.*, 23. The Homeric ἀήρ has been regarded as equivalent to αὐήρ = ἀϝήρ (cf. Dor. ἀβήρ and Aiolic αὔηρ). Ἄιδος, which has been cited as offering a parallel case of the vocalization of αϝ, must be classed elsewhere on account of the Attic Ἅιδης; see § 30; so, too, ἀΐσσω cannot be explained as = αὐίσσω (Fick), since an ἀϝίσσω would have become αἴττω.[1] ἀήρ in Attic is not a form in accordance with the genius of that dialect. Were the ᾱ genuine we should have to seek for a root αἰϝ. Wackernagel, K. Z., XXVII, 276, ventures the assertion that it is an importation of the philosophers and the poets. While this still awaits confirmation, it is clear that ἄϝ = Aiolic αυ cannot be reflected by Attic ᾱ; in other words, that ϝ upon its disappearance lengthens a preceding vowel, must be abandoned as an inveterate superstition. Scholars have only just learned that the loss of the palatal spirant *yod* does not lengthen a preceding vowel. The momentary appearance of ἄϝ as ἄυ under the ictus in Homer cannot cause ἄ to be regarded as long elsewhere. Homeric verse does not make Greek words for the dialects which live their own life. We must always distinguish between words that have been adopted into literature from Homer in the Homeric form and the phonetics of the dialects which are free from such external influence.

ἠέρος in Herodotos is a mere reproduction of the Homeric form, which is due to the Ionic transcribers who inconsequentially left ἀήρ, but used the Ionic η in the genitive. Consistency had required them to go that step farther which seems to have been taken by the Hippokratean ἠήρ.

NOTE. — ἠέριος, ἦρι, "*early*," are from ἀυσερι-. ἄριστον < ἄυσερ-. These words must be separated from ἀήρ, etc. Cf. Collitz, B. B. X. 62, Brugmann in Curt. *Stud.* IX. 392, and *Grundr.* II. § 122.

39. H = Â of Doric, E of Attic, and of later Ionic by *metathesis quantitatis*.

In the Hipponaktian ληός we have the oldest Ionic stage of pre-Hellenic *λᾱϝος which can be recognized upon Greek soil. ληός is found in a Ms. of Hdt., V, 42. Were it not for λεώς I, 22, II, 129, VIII, 136, ληός might claim admission to the text of the historian with the same justice as νηός. See § 30.

[1] ἀΐσσω, Attic ἄττω < ϝαιϝικιν. Cf. ᾱ as representative of αιϝ in δᾱήρ = δαιϝήρ, Skt. devár-, and in ἀεί = αἰϝεί.

Digitized by Google

νηός < *νᾱϝος in Hdt. and Lukian as in Archil., 5 (eleg.), with the retention of η, whereas, according to Merzdorf's "law" the form should not have η. The Doric genitive is νᾱός. Theognis has ναῦς 84, 856, 1361, in 970 *A* has νηυς, though Bergk reads ναῦς; ναῦν 680.[1] On the other hand, νηός 513, νηυσί 12, Solon, νηΐ 19_3, νηυσίν 13_{11} (Mimn. 9_2). The forms in η deserve comment in this connection, because of the superstition that νηυσί and ναυσί are identical as regards quantity. The α of ναυσί is short. Cf. βασιλεύς < -ηυς, Ζεύς < Ζηύς, etc. In Ionic νηῦς the η is due to νηός; νηΐ instead of νῇ is due likewise to the influence of the genitive.

40. *Ionic* H = Ā *of other dialects* (*including Attic* Ā *after* E, I, Y, P).

1. In the endings of the Vowel Declension, and in adverbs representing petrified cases of this declension.

2. In verbal forms of the -αω inflection, and in forms derived therefrom.

3. In radical and thematic syllables (excluding such as may be classed under 1 and 2).

4. In syllables of derivation.

NOTE. — εη = Attic εᾱ is derived from ε(ι)η = ε(ι)ᾱ. Cf. Attic δωρεᾱ < δωρειᾱ, which prevails till 268 B.C.

References for the study of the interrelation of Ionic η and Attic ᾱ: —

Strabo, VIII, 1, 2. Ahrens, Göttinger Philol. Versammlung, 1852. Cauer, Curt. Stud. VIII, 244, 435, and *Wochenschrift für kl. Phil.*, 1887, No. 51, Curtius, in his Studien, I, 248, Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* § 10, *Grundr.* I. § 104, Bechtel, *Phil. Anzeiger*, 1886, p. 20.

41. *Preliminary Remarks.*—The question at issue is whether Attic ᾱ is here original, or whether the Ionic η was also Attic at some period of the Attic dialect, and later became ᾱ. Certain scholars have ventured to compare the instances of Elean ᾱ = pan-Hellenic η, despite the fact that the cases are not perfectly parallel, and that the actual appearance of a "hyper-Doric ᾱ" in one dialect is not proof that an Iono-Attic η became ᾱ in Attic. The dichotomy of the Greek language into Ā and H dialects rests upon the assumption that at an extremely early period ᾱ had become η in Ionic. It may be doubted whether this shifting of pronunciation was in all quarters of the Ionic world so old as is generally assumed to be the case. We have learned

[1] Renner regards this form as a Dorism, but wishes to substitute νηύς for ναῦς.

Digitized by Google

to distinguish in the alphabets of Naxos, Keos, and perhaps Amorgos, between the sign for pan-Hellenic η and that for η = ᾱ. Now the coloring of the latter η, recalling that of ᾱ, makes it probable that the substitution of η for ᾱ was gradual in Ionic, and did not happen "at the stroke of twelve." Even though a sign was adopted different from the old A, the newer sign may have been pronounced more like the Attic ᾱ, which is an heirloom from the oldest period. Herein then is Attic more ancient than Ionic, and its ᾱ in the earliest inscriptions speaks in favor of the retention of the original sound.

NOTE. — If Attic ᾱ arose from η we might expect that an older η should be sporadically attested, or that Attic ᾱ might be substituted here and there for pan-Hellenic η. In neither case is there any support for the view that I. E. ā became η in Ionic and Attic, and afterwards became ᾱ in Attic.

In literature the adoption of the Ionic η in Ionic writers dates from a period considerably anterior to that of the inscriptions of Keos and Naxos. Whether or not the Ionic pronunciation of ā came into existence at the time of the Ionian migration eastward is impossible to state with certainty, though probability speaks in favor of the change having taken place after the Ionians had settled in Asia Minor.[1] Cf. Ionic Μῆδοι, Kypr. Μᾶδοι, Old Pers. Māda. The Ionisms of the Homeric poems represent in a majority of instances the earliest form of Ionic and have, so far as the characteristic Ionic use of η is concerned, not been retouched by the Ionic Homerids of the ninth or later centuries. This view excludes the possibility of any ᾱ's in Homer being Ionic.

Gustav Meyer has made the statement (Gr. Gramm., XXXIII) that the farther back we follow the history of the Attic dialect, so much nearer does it approach to Ionic. As regards the interrelation of ᾱ and η at least, whatever may be said of other points in question (see on ἤν, ἐάν in Ionic under *Conjunctions*, Rutherford's Phrynichus, and Verall's remarks in J. H. S., I, 260, II, 179) it cannot be affirmed that Meyer is correct. The Attic dactylic poetry of the seventh and sixth centuries rigorously excluded forms of Ionic vocalization. Thus in C. I. A., I, 471, which dates close upon the time of Solon, we find ἀνο[ρέ]αν, ἡλικίας. So, too, in C. I. A., I, 463, νεαράν, πρᾶγμ'; in IV, 477 E, γενεά. This holds good of the fifth century. Cf. Kirchhoff, Hermes, V, 54, Cauer in Stud., VIII, 244–249, Kirchhoff's remarks on C. I. A., IV, B 492, 12, and Meisterhans,[2] p. 13.

[1] From this it will be clear that I do not adopt Curtius' theory of the Ionic migration.

Digitized by Google

42. Ending of the Vowel Declension (stems in ᾱ).

A. *Masculines* in -εης, -ιης, are retained upon all early Ionic inscriptions. Ἐσνέας and Λυσαγόρας, forms assumed to exist upon the lead tablets of Styra ($19_{191 \text{ and } 244}$) have been shown, § 27, to lack foundation. Cf. 19_{56}, 19_{173} in Bechtel, Αἰνέης in Rob., 189 F, Ἀντίης, Rob., 190, no. I, E. Πυθαγόρας, Samos, 215 = Roberts, 156, in an artist's signature to an Ionic epigram. Since the giver of the εἰκών was an Epizephyrian Lokrian, Pythagorês may have adopted for his name a form in harmony with the dialect of the dedicator Euthymos.[1] Cf. the mixture of dialect at Rhegion. Whatever be the true explanation of this form, it deserves notice that this is the earliest example of -αγόρας upon an Ionic inscription. In Rob., 157, we read [Πυ]θαγόρ[α]ς, restored on the lines of 156. A coin of Samos (400–350) gives the genuine Ionic form Πυθαγόρης, Bechtel, 226, I. On Πυθαγόρης, from Selybria, see Bechtel on No. 261.

-ιας appears in Thasos at the end of the third century (Κριτίας 28 A 7); Ἠγέας in Keos, 44 B 4; Ἐλπέας, *ibid.*, 44 B 16, an early document perhaps of the fifth century; Ἀρισταγόρας, Thasos, 82 A 5 (225–200).

B. In *feminine* nouns the termination -ιη appears sporadically till after Christ in the inscriptional monuments of the Ionic dialect (cf. below, § 43). The ingression of the Attic forms in the Ᾱ declension dates from the middle of the fourth century B.C. Thus, for example, we have Κλευπάτρα, Delos, 55, III, 34 (cf. VII, 27) of the third century B.C., and ἀρᾶι, Teos, 158_{26}, Δημητρία, Chios, 192, ὑγείας, Olbia, 129_{14}, all inscriptions of late date. Upon an archaic vase (Roberts, 190) we find Χώρα, whose ᾱ perhaps makes for Attic provenance (see Kretschmer, K. Z., XXIX, 398).

Δωροφέα, Roberts, 29, upon a stone in Naxos, is certainly not an Ionian woman, not only on account of the ᾱ, but also on account of the φ for θ, which is not a substitution known elsewhere as Ionic (φ = θ in Aiolic, Boiotian, and Thessalian).

Ἥρας, Samos, 220_{36}, and 221_{37} (about 350), whereas in 226 we find Ἥρης. Cf. Greg. Corinth., 390, Gram. Meerm., 650. The η form is retained upon inscriptions till a late period, though doubtless no longer spoken. The conservative style of the inscriptions has retained Πυθαγόρης on coins of the empire (P. Gardner, *Num. Chron.*, 1882, 280).

[1] Dedicators generally have the dedicatory inscription engraved in their native alphabet; but cf. Roberts, 230, *bis*, for an exception.

Digitized by Google

On -ᾱ in the poets, see below, § 54 ff. The occurrences of ᾱ in proper names in Hdt., where η might have been expected, have been enumerated above under Ᾱ (§ 28).

43. Note on the *chronology of η after vowels and ρ in Ionic inscriptions.*

It is to be noted that upon inscriptions as late as the third century after Christ, Ionic η held its ground sporadically; *e.g.* Keos, 52, Ἰουλιητῶν (in Attic even in the fourth century B.C.); Paros, 66, Εἰλειθυίῃ; Istros, 135, Ἰστρίῃ (as late as Gordianus Pius); Priene, Πριηνέων, on a coin, Imhoof-Blumer, Monnaies Grecques, 296, No. 127 (time of Hadrian). Coins of Olbia retain -ιη till the period of Caracalla and Alexander Severus.[1]

The inscriptions before 350 B.C. generally have the Ionic η.

This retention of η, the inflection of adjectives of material in -εος, etc., and the inflection of the *Iota* declension (gen. -ιος), are the last heirlooms of the Ionic dialect that were displaced by the Attic κοινή.

44. In the following paragraphs we will attempt to discover to what extent the Ionic dialect has preserved the long vowel of the suffix -ι̯ᾱ, which in Attic and occasionally in Ionic has been displaced by -ι̯ᾰ. An immediate connection, temporal or local, between Ionic and Attic cannot be shown on the ground of this tendency, which obtains in both dialects. Thus, the usual Attic form is ἀλήθεια, a form younger than the "Old-Attic" ἀληθείᾱ and the Ionic (Homeric) ἀληθείη, since it is the result of a transferring of an abstract noun with the suffix -ι̯ᾱ into the category of the adjectival flexion, which had -ι̯ᾰ as original feminine ending. Cf. also -ηίη and -εια from -ην stems, -ιη being the substantival, -ιᾰ the adjectival, ending.[2]

The question of the interrelation of -ειη, -ηϊη, -ιη will be touched on, §§ 66, 101 ff. On Attic -εια and -ια, see Schanz, Plato, II, 2, p. vii., ff., Moiris, 199 15.

45 A. Abstract feminines in -ειη in Ionic.

Unless especially noted, no case of -ειᾰ occurs. See Choirob., Bekk. Anecd., IV, 1314; Hdn., II, 454 20; Fritsch, *Zum Vokalismus*, etc., p. 19, etc., Bredow, 127, 188. Figures without authors refer to Hdt.

[1] Ionic forms occasionally appear in the Mss. of the New Testament. Cf. Acts x, 1; xxi, 31; xxvii, 1.

[2] Ionic and Attic Εὔβοια is older than Εὐβοίᾱ, Hesiod, *W. D.*, 651. Cf. εἰδυῖαν.

Digitized by Google

Unless specially noted the forms may be referred to a nom. in -ιη.

ἀδείη, VIII, 120, but ἄδειαν, II, 121 (ζ), in all Mss.

ἀδρανείη, Aret., 150, 261.

ἀεικείη, I, 73, etc., as in Homer.

ἀκριβείη, Hippokr., ep. 17_{3}.

ἀληθείη, not ἀληθηίη, in Hdt.; ἀληθείη occurs in Euseb. Mynd., 19, 21, Luk., *Astr.*, 1, Hipp., ep. 10_{6}, 12_{4}, 17_{29}, Mimnermos 8, Iliad, Ψ 361, Ω 407, and often in the Odyssee.

ἀναιδείη, VI, 129, etc., Archil., 78_{5} (Athen., -είην, or -ειαν); Theog., 291, 648 (*O* -ίη); Hipp., ep. 17_{42}.

ἀσελγείη, Hipp., ep. $17_{60, 44}$.

ἀσθενείη, IV, 135, etc., Hipp., ΠΑ 29.

ἀσφαλείη, III, 7, etc.

ἀτελείη, I, 54, IX, 73, III, 67; ἀτε[λ]είην, Kyzikos, 108 B 3. This form has been attributed by Karsten, p. 18, to that species of Ionic which he calls Karian.[1] No other example of ἀτελείη occurs upon Ionic inscriptions, though it is the regular Ionic form which has been supplanted upon other inscriptions by the Attic ἀτέλεια, Eryth. 199_{6} (394 B.C. one of the earliest cases of the ingression of Atticisms[2]), 202_{9} (350 B.C.); Zeleia, 114 (334 B.C.); Ephesos, 147_{13} (300 B.C.); Iasos, 105_{9} (end of fourth century).

ἀτρεκείη, IV, 152, Hipp., ep. 16_{8}, 17_{56}.

αὐταρκείη, Hipp., ep. $17_{37, 44}$.

ἐμμελείη, VI, 129, where *d* has εὐμέλειαν, the other Mss. ἐμμέλειαν. Stein and Holder read -ειην.

ἐπιμελείη, Hippokr., ep. 17_{57}.

ἐπιπειθείη, Sim. Amorg., 1_{6}.

εὐηθείη, I, 60, in VII, 16 γ, *R* has εὐηθείας, not adopted by the editors.

εὐλαβείη, Hippokr., ep. 12_{4}, 16_{10}.

εὐμαρείη, II, 35, IV, 113; Greg. Corinth. § 119, εὐμαρέην δὲ, τὴν ἀπόπατον. Suidas gives both εὐμαρέη and εὐμάρεια.

εὐμενίη, II, 45, is written by Holder against the authority of the Mss., which have -εια or -εα. In II, 55, both Stein and H. write Προμένεια, the name of a Dodonaian priestess. In the case of proper names, Hdt.'s elective affinities may permit him to choose

[1] βησιλέως is Karsten's other example of "Karian" Ionic. This form is quoted from Rayet, *Rev. Arch.*, XXVIII, 109, as if existing upon a Milesian inscription. It is not found in Bechtel's collection, and vitiated by βασιλεύς, Miletos, 100_{5}.

[2] προεδρίην in the same inscription.

Digitized by Google

neither the Ionic nor the epichoric name. The name may have come to him from Attic sources.

εὐπαθείη, I, 135, etc.

εὐπετείη, V, 20.

εὐτελείη, II, 92, etc.

μεγαλοπρεπείη, I, 139, III, 125.

νωθείη, Aret., 208.

ξυγγενείη, Hippokr., ep. 17_{42}.

πολυτελείη, II, 87.

πολυπληθείη, Hippokr., ΠΑ 22.

πρεσβυγενείη, VI, 51.

προμηθείη is correctly handed down in Xenoph., 1_{24}. Hdt. has προμηθίη, I, 88, III, 36 (CPd, -είη). A schol., quoted by Bredow, p. 188, says τῆς νεωτέρας Ἰάδος ἐστὶ τὸ λέγειν τὴν προμήθειαν προμηθίαν.

προσηνείη, Aret., 250, Hippokr., ΠΔΟ, 21.

σιτοδείη, I, 22, 94.

συμπαθείη, Aret., 145, 152, ξυμ-, 153.

ὑγιείη, II, 77; ὑγεία, Paros., 67; ὑγείας, Olbia, 129_{14}. On ὑγεία for ὑγίεια, see Blass, *Aussprache,*[3] p. 60, who compares late Boiotian Θεισπείων for Θεισπιείων, C. D. I., 816. On Attic ὑγιᾶ and ὑγιῇ, see Meisterhans,[2] p. 118. Aret., 12, Euseb. Mynd., 26 have ὑγιείη, and so in Hippokr. ep. 17_{2}, 26, EI, 11, ΠΑ 2, 9. ὑγείη, Aret., 95, 120.

φιλομαθείη, Euseb. Mynd., 1.

φρενοβλαβείη, Luk., *Syr.*, 18.

ὠφελείη might be expected in view of ἀνωφελής in Aischylos; and Gram. Leidensis, p. 628, says, χρῶνται (Ἴωνες) μὲν οὖν τῷ η ἀντὶ τοῦ α, ὅταν λέγωσι . . . ὠφελείην ἀντὶ τοῦ ὠφέλειαν. Both these forms, however, find no support from inscriptions (Attic ὠφελία in all inscriptions). Herodotos, V, 98, and Hippokr., EI, 7, ΠΔΟ, 51, ep. $17_{4, 25}$, seems to have used ὠφελίη. Aretaios, 238, and Eusebios, § 4, adopt the same form.

45 B. Other forms in -ειη (-ειᾰ) < -εσια.

θερείη, I, 189. Bekk., Anecd., θερεία.

περιφάνεια, Holder's reading, Hdt., IV, 24, though supported by all the Mss., should yield to Stein's -είη.

ὑπώρεα, Hdt., IV, 23,[1] for -ε(ι)α from ὄρος, a word of doubtful etymology. Hipponax, 35_{5}, ὀρείας, Hdt., ὀρεινός.

πανώλεα and ἐξώλεα, Bechtel, 263, found in Lykia, belong to the

[1] ὑπωρείη is to be expected. This form is found, II, 158 (*R*).

Digitized by Google

same class as ὑπώρε(ι)α, but it is not certain that these forms are not Attic.

Ἡρακλείη, V, 43 (-ειαν, ABCd, Stein -κλείην), but II, 44, Ἡράκλεια, Holder. Ἡράκλεος appears frequently in Hdt. Upon inscriptions, Ἡρακλείοισιν, Teos, 156 B 33; Ἡρακλείου, Eryth., 201, 17; Ἡράκλεος, Eryth., 206 A 12 (third century); Ῥοδόκλεια, Samos, 225 (late).

-ειᾰ- occurs only in the following cases without any variant in -ειη: Aret., 147, 324, ξυνάφεια; Hippokr., ἀκράτεια, ΠΚ 170; ἀσφάλεια, ΕΙ 11, ΠΔΟ 9, ΠΤΚ 19, Π 22; Euseb. Mynd., ἐγκράτεια, 26.

46. Feminines in -εί̆η or -ειᾰ derived from -ηυ- stems.

ἱρείη, in Hdt., V, 72; II, 53, ABC, ἱέρειαι, II, 55, *id.*, the reading adopted by Holder. In II, 55, occurs Προμένεια, on which see § 45 A. ἱέρεια is the Homeric (Z 300) and original form. Upon Ionic inscriptions we have this form, Keos, 48, of the fourth century. Contracted form ἱερῆ < ἱερέη,[1] Pantikap., 123_3, Ephesos, 150 (late). If ἱέρεια is correct, we have in Hdt. the older and the younger form co-existing. ἱερείᾰ is attested by grammarians as Attic, though ἱέρε(ι)ᾰ, too, is Attic (Meisterhans,[2] p. 32).

βασίλεια appears in numerous passages in Hdt. without a variant, and is the Homeric and original form. The v. l. βασιληίης, I, 211, in *R* is an hyper-Ionism.

Bredow has collected the cases of -ειᾰ, -οιᾰ, -αιᾰ, and -ειη, -οιη, -αιη, in proper names in Hdt. The explanation of the forms in -ᾰ is often a matter of extreme difficulty.

47. Ionic -ιη = Attic -ιᾰ appears, furthermore, in Ὠρειθυίη, Hdt., VII, 189 = Attic Ὠρείθυια. Cf. ὄργυια, by the side of the later ὀργυιή (-ιά̆).

NOTE. — Hippokrates and Aretaios have μίη, οὐδεμίη, etc., whereas Hdt. always uses μίᾰ, οὐδεμίᾰ, etc. μιᾶ[ς], Olynthos, 8 B 13, but Ionic μιῆς, Sim., Amorg., 2; μιῇ, Theognis, 664, in *A. O.* Lukian, *Syr.*, 19, *Astr.*, 27, 29, has οὐδεμίην.

On the nom. ᾰ = η, see *sub* A, § 3.

48. *Adverbs* representing petrified case-forms of the Â declension have throughout the Ionic η, *e.g.* λίην (cf. Greg. Corinth. § 58) λάθρη, πέρην (Arrian, 3) πέρηθε.

[1] Kallim., Epigr., 40, has Ἱερέη.

Digitized by Google

49. II. In verbal forms of the -αω inflection, and in derived forms. καταρήσεσθαι, πειρήσομαι (cf. Theog., 126) θεήσεσθαι, Ἄδρηστος, Tyrt., 12_{1}, in Hdt. and on a vase, Roberts, 194. Ἄδραστος, Smyrna, 153_{17}, an inscription of Attic inclinations. Cf. also ἠγόρασεν, Eryth., 206 B 48, C 44, Νικασίωνος, Thasos (Louv.), 20 C 9. Πολυάρητος, Thasos, 72_{3}, but Ἄρατος, Eryth., 206 B 44.

50. III. Words containing H = I. E. Â in the radical and thematic syllables. A few examples of each class will suffice.

η = extra-Ionic ᾱ, after ρ.

γρηῦς; for which Bergk reads γραῦς, Archil., 31, though Schneidewin long ago corrected the Ms. to γρηῦς. There is no warrant for supposing that the inflection of γρηῦς differed from that of νηῦς in the nom.; and in Archil., 168, Bergk reads γρηῦν. γρηῦς should not be derived from γραῦις (Curtius, Et.[5], 176, cf. Schmidt, K. Z. XXVII, 375), but is probably an immovable feminine adjective like θῆλυς in θῆλυς ἐέρση, ἡδύς in ἡδὺς ἀϋτμή; and of this, γραῦις and γραῖα are the movable feminine forms. γραῖα appears to be a solitary example of a υ-stem which has not taken on the -εια inflexion. γραῦις is of Aiolic source. γρῆϋς in Homer is scarcely an analogue to πρέσβυς, as Brugmann, M. U., III, 25, suggests.

κεκρημένος, Hdt., III, 106, against the authority of all the Mss., cf. Hippokr., κέκρημαι. The base κερα has the form κρᾱ = Ionic κρη. ἀκρητοπότης, -ποσίη, Hdt.

πιπρήσκω (cf. Kallimachos, 85), πρ]ηθέντων, Eryth., 204_{6}; Hdt. πρηθῆναι. Solon, however, has πραθέντες, 4_{25} eleg., 36_{7} trim.

πρήσσω: Πρηξάσπης, Πρηξίλεως, Πρηξῖνος in Hdt. Πρηξίπολις, Thas. (L.), 8 B 6, 10_{4}, 11 B 3, 13_{11}, 21_{2}. Πρηξίλεως, Thas. (L.), 3 B 8, cf. Thasos, 75 A 7. Πρηξᾶς, Eryth., 206 A 11. Πρηξαγόρης, Thas. (L.), $10_{2,6}$. Πρηξώ, Kyme, 20; Πρήξιον, Delos, 57; ἐκπρηττόντων, 22_{6}, near Eretria; πρηξάντων, Teos, 158_{17}, Chios, 174 A 15, 20; πρῆχμα, Chios, 174 B 18, 174 C 7 (also Attic, C. I. A., III, 382_{2}). In Hdt. the Attic forms have crept into some Mss. Cf. I, 8, V, 12, VII, 147. Theognis has η forms, 70, 80, 73, 1026, 1027, 553, 661, 953, 461, 1031, 1075, but the ᾱ forms in *A* or in other Mss., 204, 659, 256, 644, 642, 1051. Ionic inscriptions, too, have admitted the Attic forms, Mylasa, 248 A 10 (367–6 B.C.), 248 C 10 (355–4), Ephesos, 147_{18}, about 300 B.C.

πρηύς, πρηΰνεσθαι in Hdt., Πρηύλος, name of a Thasiote, Πρηῦχος of a Styraian, 19_{347} (cf. Πρε-άνθης, Keos, 50, IV, 65). πρηέα, Luk., *Astr.*, 29.

Digitized by Google

ῥηδίως, ῥηστώνη in Hdt. and Luk., *Syr.*, 20, *Astr.*, 21. Cf. Aiolic βρᾱ́διος = ϝρᾱ́διος, Theokr., XXX, 27, βραιδίως. Osthoff, *Perfect.*, 446 ff., explains ῥᾱ́ιων = ῥᾱσίων = Lat. rārior (*vrāsos).

ῥηχίη, *flood-tide*, in Hdt., can have nothing to do with ῥήγνυμι as L. S. state, since the latter has pan-Hellenic η.[1] Connect rather ῥᾰχις, *spine*, Hdt., III, 54. For the use of names of parts of the body to express natural objects, cf. *arm of the sea*, *shoulder of the mountain*, Gk. πολυδειράς Ὄλυμπος, etc.

τρηχύς. The relation of τρᾱ to ταρα in ταραχή, τάραξις is not perfectly clear, though it is probable that there is a correspondence of types, κερα : κρᾱ : : ταρα : τρᾱ. τρηχέα in Hdt., VII, 33, is due to Abicht, the Mss. having the Attic form which comes to light in Solon, 4_{25}. The genuine Ionic form is found in Tyrtaios, 12_{22}, Hipponax, 47_{2}.

The pseudo-Ionists generally adopt the Ionic forms.

51. Νικήνορος, Thasos (L), 12 C 11, may serve as an example of η = ᾱ lengthened from ᾰ upon formation of a compound word. See § 36. On Λοχᾱγός in Styra, see above, § 27.

52. Ionic η = extra-Ionic ᾱ, after vowels.

Ἰήσων in Hdt., but Ἰάσων, Halik., 240_{23}.

ἰητρός, Pantik., 119; Ἰστρίη, Istros, 135.

νεηνίης Hdt., cf. Νεήπολις, Bechtel, 4_{1}. The stem νεᾱ- varies with νεο-; Νεοπολιτέων, 4_{2}, cf. 4_{3} and 4_{4}. Cf. Φαίηλος, Thasos (L.), 7 B 6, from φαιο-, as Κύδρηλος from κυδρο-. Cf. Ἑρμάφιλος, Th. (L.), 20 C 8, and Ἑρμόφιλος.

παιήων, the Homeric form, is still preserved in Archilochos 76. Hdt. has παιωνίζω.

Πριηνέων, Imhoof-Blumer, Monn. Grecq., No. 127, period of Hadrian; ΠΡΙΗ, Bechtel, No. 143.

τιήρη, Hdt., VIII, 120, but τιάρα, I, 132, III, 12, retained by Stein and Holder.

τριήκοντα and other forms of τριη- in composition. τριήκοντα, Eryth., 202_{17}, cf. Mylasa, 248 A 1, Keos, 43_{20}, Chios, 174 B 23, D 15, Thasos (L.), 9_{6}, has an η = ᾱ that is probably not original, despite the ᾱ of the I. E. neuter pl. *triā* took its ᾱ from the *o* decl. when the plural of the *o* stems ended in ᾱ. See Schmidt's *Neutra*, p. 39.

[1] ναυηγίη, *shipwreck* = Attic ναυᾱγίη contains, of course, the lengthened form of ϝᾰγ, ablaut of ϝᾰγ (κατεηγότα in Hdt. and Hippokr.).

Digitized by Google

διη- in διηκοσίων, Zeleia, 114 D 5, Chios 174 D 18. The long vowel is due to the influence of that of τριηκόσιοι. See Spitzer, *Lautlehre des Arkad.*, p. 19.

53. IV. Syllables of Derivation containing H.

For example, in Herodotos, Σαρδίηνος, Κρηστωνιήτης, Σπαρτιήτης, Αἰγινῆται. Τεγέη, Τεγεήτης (Τεγέη is from Τεγείη as δωρεά from δωρειά in Attic, if the latter, as Dittenberger thinks, is not the younger form), Βαργυλιητῶν, Bechtel, 252. In Ὀρνεᾶται, Hdt., VIII, 73, Stein has the epichoric form, though in the same chapter Παρωρεῆται. On other names in -ᾶται in Hdt., see above, § 28. Arrian, 5, has Τιτῆνος.

Ionic θώρηξ, θωρηκοφόροι in Hdt. and Arrian, *Ind.*, 16 (but see Hdt., I, 135). ἴρηξ = Attic ἱέρᾱξ, etc. στύρᾰξ is the Herodotean form (in III, 107, one Ms. has στύρηκα).

Ποσειδάωνος ἄνακτος, Archil., 10, is not in the Mss., but corresponds to Ποσειδάωνα ἄνακτα, Iliad, XV, 8. Cf. § 11.

54. The verdict of Attic metrical inscriptions (§ 41) in favor of the adoption of the Attic vocalization of forms which might, on the view that the influence of the epic dialect was paramount, have been Ionic, invites an investigation of Ionic poetry as to how far it has preserved η after ε, ι, υ, and ρ in the four categories enumerated in § 40. Ionic was the dialect of the Greek literary world prior to the advent of Attic, as Attic was the medium of literary expression until the advent of the κοινή. The question at issue here is: How far does the dialect of poets born in Ionia differ, if it differs at all, from the dialect of poets whose birthplace or place of residence was in a canton whose speech had never admitted η after ε, ι, υ, and ρ? In other words, are the ᾱ's of Tyrtaios due to his Spartan home, and are the ᾱ's of Solon the result of his Athenian citizenship? Furthermore, we can here but call attention to the fact that the Mss. of the Ionic poetry may have suffered, either from the hands of ignorant scribes who knew only the common dialect of their time, or from preconceived notions as to the character of early iambic, trochaic and elegiac poetry.

55. Tyrtaios: In the elegies, where, on any view, we should expect to find fewer cases of ᾱ than in the *embateria*, we notice αἰσχρᾶς δὲ φυγῆς 12_{17}, ἀτιμία 10_{10}, ἐχθρὰν-ψυχήν 11_{3} and ἀνιαρότατον 10_{4} in Mss. Less cogent is ἁ φιλοχρηματία Σπάρταν ὀλεῖ 3_{1}, since these words represent the response of the Delphic oracle to Lykurgos,

Digitized by Google

while Σπάρτας in 4_4 (accord. to Plutarch) might be excused for a reason not very dissimilar, though the Σπάρτης of Diod. Sic. seems more probable.

Elsewhere the Ionic forms prevail: στυγερῇ πενίῃ 10_8, εὐρείης 11_{24}, δεξιτερῇ 11_{25}, βίην 12_2, τρηχείας, accus., 12_{27}, Ἀδρήστου 12_8. Since it is more probable that the later copyists should have inserted an Attic ᾱ in place of η than that they should have changed a Doric ᾱ to η in elegiac compositions, I regard αἰσχρᾶς, ἀτιμία, ἐχθράν, and ἀνιαρότατον as foreign to the original dialect of Tyrtaios.

In the case of the *embateria*, we shall, I think, have to accept as certain an admixture of Lakonian forms. Thus we find Σπάρτας 15_1, πολιατᾶν 15_2 (cf. Pindar, Isthm. I, 51), λαίᾳ 15_2, τᾶς ζωᾶς 15_5, τᾷ Σπάρτᾳ 15_6. Bergk's reading, Ἄγετ', ὦ Σπάρτας ἔνοπλοι κοῦροι, ποτὶ τὰν Ἄρεος κίνασιν, in fragment 16, presents a hopeless mixture of Doric and Ionic, such as the Spartan youth would scarce have listened to. κίνασιν is a "hyper-Dorism," unattested for the period of the early Messenian wars; and κοῦροι should be κῶροι, if Doric. Hephaistion has κίνησιν correctly enough.

56. In the case of poets of Ionic birth, whose art is Ionic, the restoration of the genuine Ionic forms in η offers but little difficulty. Thus we have an Attic ἀνθίας in Ananios, 5 (θείην 1_2), and Ἀναξαγόρας in Anakreon, 105.

57. The temptation to Atticize Solon was still greater. Though it is not advisable to go so far as Fick in rejecting all traces of Solon's dependence upon his elegiac predecessors, some evidence in favor of the retention of Attic ᾱ is found, not only in the fact that contemporary Attic dactylic poetry used the native ᾱ, but also in the numerous instances of the occurrence of ᾱ in the Mss.

In his trimeters we find ἐλευθέρα 36_3, βίαν 36_{14} (Plut., βίην), πραθέντας 36_7. η in ἀναγκαίης 36_8, δουλίην 36_{11}.

In the tetrameters: ἄγραν 33_3, ἡμέραν μίαν 33_6, μιάνας 32_3. η in βίης 32_2.

In the elegies, where the greatest dependence upon epic forms might be anticipated: ἡμετέρα 4_1, βίᾳ 4_{26}, δυσνομία 4_{32}, εὐνομία 4_{33}, λαμπρᾶς 9_2 (*sic* Diod. Sic. Plut., -ῆς, Diog. L.), ὑμετέραν 11 (*sic* Diod. Sic., -ην, Plut. Diog. L.); also in πραθέντας 4_{25}, τραχέα 4_{35}, πραΰνει 4_{38}, ῥᾴδιον 9_5.

If it is possible to distinguish between the dialectal preferences of the Solonian metres, η may be defended even in the trimeters and

Digitized by Google

tetrameters on the view that the background, especially of the iambic trimeter, is Ionic. If ᾱ be genuine here, η must have been introduced by scribes prepossessed by the belief that Solon was entirely dependent upon the Ionic dialect in matters of vocalization.

In the elegiac poems there is no positive proof that Solon adopted Attic forms where they differed from Ionic, nor, on the other hand, have we criteria sufficient to establish the uniform appearance of the Ionic forms. While we may assume that Solon did not mix dialects, nevertheless the solution of the question which form he preferred must be left open until this point is discussed more fully from the vantage ground of literary history.

58. The Theognidean collection offers so much that is adventitious that the question as to whether or not Theognis colored his Ionic elegies with slight masses of local matter is rendered well-nigh insurmountable. The cases of ᾱ in the chief Mss. are as follows: —

πρᾶγμα 256, 642, 644, 1051; ῥᾴδιον and connected words, 120, 429, 1220; μικρά 607; Τιμαγόρα 1059 (by conj.); ἐχθρά 270 (in some Mss.); παιδείας 1305, cf. 1348; πατρῴας 1210, 888; σμικρᾷ 323; μιᾷ 664 (some Mss. μιῇ); λείαν 1327; δυστυχίαν 1188 (*A* has -η, as frequently where the Mss. divide on this question); ναῦς 84, 856, 970, 1361; ναῦν 680. Renner wishes to read νηῦς 84, 856, and 970 (*A* νηυς). The genitive sing. and dat. plur. are νηός 513 and νηυσί 12.

Xenophanes preserves the Ionic η everywhere except in κρατήρ 1₄; on ἔμπᾱς, see above, § 31.

59. Ionic H = Attic A.

διπλήσιος, πεντα-, ἑξαπλήσιον, πολλαπλήσια, Hdt. The latter form, III, 135, where *ABR* have the Attic form; which comes to light in διπλάσιον, Teos, 158₂₂, an almost completely Atticized inscription. Cf. Gothic ain-falþs.

The genuine Herodotean form πεντακόσιοι is amply attested (III, 90, IX, 29), and in the Chian inscription, 174 D 7 (π[ε]ντακοσίων). πεντᾰκοσιοι has its πεντᾰ- on the lines of τετρᾰ-, ἑπτᾰ-. The form πεντη- in certain Mss. of Hdt. (III, 13, VII, 186) is doubtless to be explained on the view that the scribe had in his mind's eye the Homeric πεντηκόσιοι (γ 7), whose η is due at once to the influence of πεντήκοντα and at the same time to the ictus.

Instances of -η=ᾰ in suffix syllables have been adduced, § 3.

Digitized by Google

Such forms as μοίρη, σπείρη (Greg. Corinth. *d. d. Ion.*, p. 390), γεφύρη, occasionally in the Mss. of Hdt., are hyper-Ionisms.

Ionic νηῦς, νηυσί = νᾶῦς, νᾶῦσι, is due to case levelling, the η forms being strictly in place only in such cases as the genitive singular where the case termination begins with a vowel.

Kallinos' Ἡσιονῆας (5) has been regarded by Fick, *Odyssee*, p. 24, as an instance of ictus lengthening, Steph. Byzant. connecting Ἡσονία with Ασία. ἤκην, cited as a parallel instance from Archilochos by Fick, has been differently explained, § 38; and Ἡσιονῆας may rest ultimately upon similar ablaut gradations. At least it is premature to assume lengthening *per ictum* in so hazy a word.

NOTE. — Prof. Fick's contention that ἤμορος is a living Ionic form for ἄμμορος, still awaits proof. Evidence in favor of his view may be found in the gloss of Hesychios: ἠμορίς· κενή, ἐστερημένη· Αἴσχυλος Νιόβῃ. This would then be another indication of the close interrelation between the dialect of the Ionians and that of the Attic tragedy. ἄμμορος is a strange form in Hipponax (2), a poet whose intellectual constitution and whose use of language is alien to the retention of such Homeric forms as are Aiolic in coloring.

60. H = E.

See § 10. On θηέομαι = θεάομαι, see on the verb; on the interrelation of ει and ηι, see § 100–107.

61. Ionic H = I.

No interchange of η and ι can be maintained on the score of the name Σημονίδης, attested as that of the iambographic poet by Et. Mag., and adopted by Christ in his History of Greek Literature. Elsewhere no trace of this form of the name appears; while Σιμωνίδης is genuine Ionic from the evidence of a lead tablet from Styra (19_{139}), and it is under this name that the author of the *Mirror of Women* is usually cited by ancient authorities.

62. Ionic H = Ω.

Μαιῆτις, often in Hdt. with different suffix than in Μαιῶτις, the later name. Cf. Μαιῆται = Μαιῶται, Hdt. IV, 123. Hdt. generally used -ωτις-, -ωτης (Πελασγιώτιδες, Φθιῶτις, Θεσσαλιῶτις). Ἱστιαῶτις is the form in Hdt. as in Strabo, though VIII, 23, *R* has Ἱσταιήτιδος. Ἀμπρακιητέων is the accepted form, IX, 28, -ιήτας 31, but Ἀμπρακιώτῃσι occurs VIII, 47.

Archilochos has παιήονα. See §§ 11, 71, 146.

Digitized by Google

63. Ionic H = AI.

μιηφόνου, Archilochos, 48 = Homeric μιαίφονε (E 31). A similar balance of η and αι forms appears in Ἀλθημένεος, Bechtel, Thas. (L.), 4 B 3, and Ἀλθαιμένης.

64. Long Iota.

1. Ionic with other Hellenic dialects has retained a few cases of ῑ which may be assumed to be proethnic.

2. ῑ on Hellenic soil from ινϝ(τίνω), etc., ιρῑ, οἰκτίρω, ἴλεος, and ἵλαος < σισλη-. On ῑ from contraction of ι + ε in ἱρός, ἱρείη, etc., in Herodotos, see under Contraction of Vowels.

Ionic is on a plane with the non-assimilating dialects (*i.e.* all except Aiolic and Thessalian) in lengthening short iota + σμ to ῑμ (Ἴμερος, Perinthos, 234 B 25). γίνομαι < γιγν-[1] seems to have been the accepted form of the fifth century, though we lack the evidence of old inscriptions. Oropos, 18_{17}, about 400 B.C., has γινέσθων, Mylasa, 248 A 15 (367–6 B.C.), γίνεσθαι, Teos, $158_{5,26}$ (first century), γινόμενοι. If we may trust the Mss. of the iambographic poets, γίγνομαι is the better attested form for their period. The substitution of γίνομαι for γίγνομαι appears to have taken place earlier in Ionic than in Attic, in the inscriptions of which latter dialect γιν- does not come to light until 292 B.C. The Herodotean γῑνώσκω is not met with upon Attic inscriptions until the period of Roman supremacy. Hdt. uses μίσγω, not μίγνυμι, on which see A. J. P., VI, 449.

ῑ under influence of the ictus in κάκῑον, Archil. 13; συνέετε, Archil. 50, ἐσθίειν, Anan. 5_4.

65. Itacism. It is extremely doubtful whether there is any instance of itacism in inscriptional Ionic of the fifth or previous centuries. In the third edition of his *Aussprache* (p. 58) Blass has withdrawn all the examples he had collected (ed. 2, p. 51) from the inscriptions in proof of an early appearance of ι for ει. In the case of Μαρωνιτέων, 196_4, not noticed by Blass, we have a form by the side of which exist Μαρωνειτέων, 196_3, and Brit. Mus. Catal. 125, No. 15, and Μαρωνηιτέων, 196_2, all three forms occurring upon coins before 400. The coin, Brit. Mus. Catal. 125, 15, has Μαρωνειτέων on the front

[1] Hoffmann (D. M. G., p. 23) denies that γίνομαι arose from γίγνομαι and derives it from *γίνϝομαι (cf. jinvati), but takes no note of γῑνώσκω. Both arose from γιϝν-.

Digitized by Google

and Μαρωνιτῶν on the reverse; Μαρωνιτέων occurring after 400 in Bechtel, 196_{6}. In such forms as show both ηι and ει, the former is the older form, as in Attic Ἀριστηίδης and Ἀριστείδης; but no instance of a parallel form in ῑ can be adduced. An Ἀριστοκλίδης, Styra, 19_{16}, is derived from Ἀρίστοκλος, an Ἀριστοκλείδης, Styra, 19_{12}, from Ἀριστοκλῆς. Greg. Corinth. *d. d. Ion.*, p. 379, attests the existence of diaeresis in Πηλεΐδης and Πηληΐδης, thereby confusing Homeric and Herodotean Ionic. On the latter form and on other Herodotean patronymics, see Bredow, p. 190.

There are several forms in the Ionic of literature which point to the later confusion between the ει and ῑ sounds, such as I have shown, A. J. P., VI, 419–450, to exist in the text of Homer. Cf. *e.g.*, Πολυνείκης, Hdt. IV, 147, etc., with the spelling of Στρατονείκου, Paros, 67, and of Νείκην, Olbia, 129_{11}, both of the period of the empire. For the older forms in ῑ, see *Roehl*, 79, 515. Πολύνικος occurs on inscriptions from Attika and elsewhere (C. I. G. Samos, 2248, etc. See Baunack, *Gortyn.* p. 58). The early ει forms may be rescued by the proportion νείκη : νίκη : : τείμη : τιμή. See § 83.

Τείμαρχος, Styra, 19_{31}, is Lenormant's incorrect reading for Τιμ-. Τειμ- is, however, attested in Τειμαγόρα, Cauer, 195_{24} (Rhodes). This form is due to the influence of τείσω, ἔτεισα, Τεισικράτης, etc.

Εἰδομένευς, Thasos (L.), 5_{6}, about 300 B.C. (cf. Εἰδομενέα, C. I. G. 2184, -εῖ 6418), may be derived from εἴδομαι. Ὀλβιοπολειτέων, Olbia, 130_{3} (not before 200 B.C.), is certainly itacistic. Ὀλβιοπολιτέων, 130_{2}. Ἀφροδείτης, Eryth. 206, c. 48, with later ει.

The Homeric Πολυΐδος I have treated, A. J. P., VI, 440. The form Πολύιδος occurs upon a metrical inscription from Amorgos (No. 35) of the fourth or third century, unknown to Schulze, K. Z., XXIX, 236, who assumes -ῖδος, and in a document from Halikarnassos, 240_{46} (fifth century according to Dittenberger). Πολυίδειος, Thessal. 345_{84}. The form Πολυείδης, if it existed in earlier Ionic, must have ceased to exist in Ionia by the fourth century. The forms in ῑ seem well attested.

For ἵλη Stein writes εἵλη, I, 73, and εἵλας, I, 202, εἰλαδόν, I, 172. Cf. Kret. ἀχιλλάν· ἀρχιποίμενα. In the *Glossary* to Herodotos, Stein, II, 465, we find εἰρήν, so also Plut. Lyk. 17; whereas Hesychios has ἴρανες · οἱ εἴρενες. The Spartan ἴρην has been claimed by Brugmann, Curt. *Stud.* IV, 116, and J. Schmidt, *Vocal.* II, 330, to be derived from ἔρσην, through *ἔρρην and ἴρρην. ἴρην is like ἰρής and ἐρής, an independent nominative, whereas εἰρήν is itacistic (Baunack, K. Z., XXVII, 566).

Digitized by Google

ἰτέη, in Hdt. I, 194 is proved by the *εἰτέα* of Attic inscriptions to be itacistic.

66. To the forms terminating in *-ειη* from *-ες* stems, quoted above, § 44, there exist in the Mss. of Herodotos sporadic variants in *-ῖη*, none of which forms deserve recognition as genuine Ionisms; and much less may they be brought in evidence for the reduction of *ει* to *ι*. There is, however, a small list of forms with no trace of *-ειη*, where Hdt. has *-ιη*, Attic *-ια*. These are: —

δημοκρατίη, εὐτυχίη, εὐωδίη, ἰσοκρατίη, λιπαρίη, συντυχίη.

Comparable to these forms are the Attic substantives in *-ία*, which, like the Ionic termination *-ιη*, is to be held to represent a transference of the *-ιη* (*-ια*) which is in place in O stems. Forms in *-ια* are claimed as the property of the *νεωτέρα Ἰάς* by a scholiast quoted by Bredow, p. 189, but without foundation. Where the Attic poets have *-ῖα* (*αἰκία*, etc.), this termination should be classed with the Homeric words in *-ῖη* (11 *in thesi*, 3 *in arsi*), the explanation of which is still involved in obscurity, despite recent attempts to clear up the nature of the *ῖ*. Cf. Johansson, K. Z., XXX, 401, B. B., XV, 176, Brugmann, *Grundriss*, II, 1, p. 313. The most probable explanation is that we have to deal with a set of doubles, due to a contamination of nom. *-ῖ-*, gen. *-ῖᾱς*, by which the *ῖ* was transferred to the oblique cases. So Danielsson (Gramm. Anm. I, 40).

Thus: nom. *αu̯ικῖ-*
gen. *αu̯ικιu̯ᾱς*, whence *αχικῖu̯ᾱ(-ς)*.

This explanation grapples at closer reach with the phenomena in question than that preferred by Jebb on Electra, 486 (small edition).

67. Relation of Ῑ to ΕΥ.

The statement that *ευ* becomes *ῑ* in *ἰθύς, ἰθύνω*, is incorrect. Hdt. has *εὐθύς*, I, 65, etc.; but *ἰθύν*, I, 185; *ἰθέα*, II, 17, etc.; *ἰθύτριχες*, VII, 70. On the stones we notice a similar juxtaposition of forms: *Εὐθύμαχος*, Styra, 19_{193},[1] *Εὐθυνείδης* 19_{191}, *Ἰθυκλέη[ς]* 19_{46}, *ἴθυνα* Chios, *B. P. W.*, 1889, p. 1195. See Bezzenberger in his *Beiträge*, IV, 345. Wackernagel, K. Z., XXIX, 151, suggests that *ἴθυ-* became *εἰθυ-* in post-Homeric times through influence of *εὐθυ-* (I. E. ūdhú).

[1] *Ε(ὐ)θύμαχος* 19_{39}, not *Ἐ(ϝ)θύμαχος*, G. Meyer, *Gramm.*, § 121 note.

Digitized by Google

68. Ȳ.

1. I.E. *υ* is retained.

2. *ῡ* developed on Greek soil as in other dialects, *e.g.* *ῡ* from *υσν.* *βῦνω*, Hdt. II, 96.

ὀρσοθύρης, Sim. Amorg. 17, has *ῡ* due apparently to the ictus.

ῡ is not interchangeable with *ω*; *κύμη* has nothing in common with *κώμη*, nor *ἀμύμων* with *αμω-*. In Ionic we find, *e.g.* *Ἀμυμόξεινος*, Styra, 19_{155}, and *Ἀμώμητος*, Thasos, 72_{1}, which reproduce the two Homeric adjectives. Hinrichs (H. E. V. A., p. 81) asserts the Aiolic character of *ἀμύμων*, though it is not clear why the Aiolians should have possessed a monopoly of this word.

Ω.

69. Ω for A.

ζώω = *ζάω* is not restricted to Ionic, since we have in Boiotian *ζώω* and in Kretan *δώω*. *ζώω* seems to have been formed from an aorist **ἔζων*, present **ζῶμι*. Whether we have to deal with a reduction of *ω* to *ο* in *ζόω* that is specifically Greek, and whether the *ω* forms are pro-Hellenic, is not certain. In Ionic both the *ω* and *ο* forms exist, *e.g.* *ζόειν*, Sim. Amorg. 1_{17}; cf. *ζόες · ζῇ*, which Brugmann, M. U., III, 6, classes with his *injunctives*. Parallelism of *ω* and *ο* is not unusual, as witness *γιγνώσκω*, Aiol. *γνοέω*, Attic *ἀμφιγνοέω*, *χλωρός*, *χλόη*; *λώοντο*, Kallim., *λοέω*, etc. Homeric *ζωός* is a later formation for older *ζώς*, Brugmann, *Grundr.* I, p. 458, *ζόη* < *ζωή*, as *νεῶν* < *νηϝῶν*, *ibid.*, p. 463.

70. Ionic Ω where Attic has E.

πλώω in Homer and Hdt. for *πλέω*, though the latter is more frequent (Bredow, 171). *πλώω* has been held to contain an *ω* which is the ablaut of *η*, and which does not originally belong in the present; M. U., I, 45. *πλω*, on this view, seems to be treated like *γνω* or *δω*. King-Cookson record a different explanation, p. 84, which is less satisfactory than that of Johansson, D. V. C., p. 159, who shows that *πλω* has a proethnic *ō* (Germ. flôdus). Saussure regards *πλώω* as a comparatively late formation (*Mém.* 67).

71. Ionic Ω = Attic Ᾱ.

θῶκα and *θωκέω* in Hdt. with the ablaut in *ω*, cf. Attic *θᾶσσω*, *θᾱκέω*. Hdt. has *παιωνίζω*, which is also the Attic prose form except in Xeno-

Digitized by Google

phon, *Symp.* 2, 1. The noun has always ᾱ. Theog. 779, παιᾶσιν cf. Archil. παιήονα, 76. See § 146.

72. Ionic Ω = Attic H.

For Attic πτήσσω we have the Homeric πτώσσω in Hdt. IX, 48; cf. Iliad, IV, 372, πτωσκάζω. Ionic πτώσσω (Eustath. *ad locum*) is either a denominative or a present formed from the base of the perfect.

On the suffix -ητις, -ωτις, see under H, § 62.

73. Ω = Ῑ.

ἄμπωτις, Hdt. Cf. Aiolic πώνω and πῶ from perf. *πέπωα. See Schulze, K. Z. XXVII, 420.

74. Ionic Ω = AY.

In a few Ionic words the α of αυ seems, through influence of υ, to have taken upon itself an ο coloring, and this ο + υ to have been pronounced as ω; cf. Delphic ὠτόν, Spart. ὠτῶ.

We have thus ἀφώσκω, Hdt. III, 86, but -αυ- probably IX, 13, and ὑπόφαυσις, VII, 36. φώσκω may still be heard at Anchialos on the Black Sea. So also ω for αυ in τρῶμα, τρωματίης, τρωματίζειν, κατατετρωματίσθαι in Hdt., with similar forms in Hippokrates, Aretaios, and Arrian, *Ind.* 19. In Hdt. IV, 180, the Mss. have τρωυμάτων, which Stein corrects to τρω-. τρωῦμα is found in Lukian, *d. d. S.*, 20, in all Mss. except *E*. θῶμα occurs in Mss. of Hdt. with such frequency that we may well question whether Dindorf's θῶμα and τρῶμα are not preferable to Bredow's and Stein's θωῦμα and τρωῦμα. The pseudo-Ionists, however, offer slender support to θῶμα (Arrian, *Ind.* 34, 40, θαῦμα 15, Eusebios, § 3, θώματι); and Lukian testifies in every passage to θωῦμα. See § 126.

75. Ionic Ω = Attic OY.

ὦν is the form of the adverb in the Aiolic, Boiotian, Doric, and Ionic dialects. Thessalian οὖν is only apparently equivalent to Attic οὖν, which seems to have been engrafted upon Homer upon the authority of Aristarchos, who regarded the poet as an Athenian; unless it may be held that ου became ω as did αυ in τρῶμα. Hdt. has οὔκων, οὐκῶν, ὁσονῶν, τοιαργῶν, with occasional lapses in the Mss. in the direction of the Attic forms, as is the case in the Mss. of

Digitized by Google

Lukian and Arrian. The letter of Pherekyd. has ὦν; the Mss. of Hippokrates, of the letters, and of Euseb. Mynd., have οὖν. Aretaios has οὖν in the first four books, ὦν in the latter books. See § 120, note 1.

ὦς, *ear*, Delos, B. C. H., II, 322 (before 167 B.C.), is formed like φῶς. The stem ὠτ- is = οὐσατ-; οὖς is from *οὖσος. Theog. 1163 has οὔατα.

76. Ionic Ω = OH.

The Homeric and Herodotean ὀγδώκοντα is either a contraction for ὀγδοη- (cf. ὀγδοῇκοντα, Attic epigram, C. I. G. 1030_2, and Solon's ὀγδωκονταέτη 20_4) or has ω from the influence of ὀκτώ. Neither ὀγδω- nor ὀγδοήκοντα has as yet turned up upon Ionic inscriptions. The Chian ὀκτακοσίων 174 C 23 does not assume the ω of Aiolic ὀκτωκόσιοι (C. D. I. 281 A 30, Lesbos). Though the Aiolic form records the influence of ὀκτώ, yet since that dialect has ὀγδοήκοντα, nothing is thereby proved as to the Ionic form. It should be borne in mind that, if the Homeric form is a contraction of ὀγδοη-, forms that arise under stress of the verse in Homer are not criteria for the common extra-Herodotean prose use.

Other instances of ω for οη are: ἀλλογνώσας, ἐννώσας, ἐννενώκασι, ἐνένωτο, in Hdt.; cf. Theognis, 1298, νωσάμενος, and νώσατο, Apoll., Rhod. IV, 1409; also ἔβωσα, ἐβώσθην, βεβωμένος, as in Homer, βώσαντι, ἐπιβώσομαι. Stein still holds (Pref. to school edition, LII) to the view that we have to go back to a stem formation in ο (νο-, βο-); cf. Leaf *ad* M 337. ἐβώθεον, ἐβώθησαν from βοηθέω (cf. Aiolic βᾱθόεντι, ἐβᾱθόη) are now expelled from the text of Hdt. Cf. Βαδρομιῶνος, Lampsakos, C. I. G. 3641 *b* 8.

The Diphthongs in Ionic.

77. AI.

We have first to investigate how often the diphthong AI loses its final mora before a vowel. See below on EI and OI, and cf. Fritsch, V. H. D., 37 ff., Allen, *Versification*, 72. The inscriptions attest the change in the following instances.

West Ionic. Τερώναον, Terone, 7 (before 420), cf. *Mittheil.* X, 367 ff.; ἀειφυγίην, Amphipolis, $10_{5,25}$ (357 B.C.); ἀειναῦτ[αι], Rob. 172, Chalkis, and according to Plut. 2, 298 C, found in Miletos; Ἀνκάος, C. I. G. 7375; Ἀκτάων 8431 (vase incr.); Μίνδαον, Mende, 17 (500–450), but Μενδαίη after 400; Σπόνδαος, Styra, 19_{141}; Αἴσκραος

Digitized by Google

19_{153}; Τίμαος 19_{313}. About the same number of forms with AI are found in West Ionic, *e.g.* Ἀθηναίη, *Volci*, Rob. I, 191.

Island Ionic. Ἀθηνάης, Delos, 54 (fifth cent.),[1] Νικᾶν, Thasos, 72_8 (300–250), = Νικάην; cf. ἱερῆ < ἱερείη. In l. 10 of the same inscription we have Ἀθηναίης. Fritsch, V. H. D., p. 37, suggests that Νικᾶς is not certainly an Ionian, being merely proxenos. Ἀθηναίη occurs frequently in the Ionic of the islands: Keos 41 (epigram), 51, Paros 64, Thasos 72_{10}; cf. also Roberts, I, p. 64, and No. 165, where an inscription of uncertain provenance has Ἀθηναῖος twice. Roberts (I, No. 26) reads Ἀθήνηι, a rare form in an old inscription, but not isolated, as we have Ἀθηνᾶ, C. I. A., IV, B 373_{65} (sixth cent.), IV, 373, w (about 400).

Asiatic Ionic. ἀεί, Iasos, 105_{10} (end of fourth cent., hence not certainly genuine Ionic); Ἀθηναίηι Φωκαεῖς, Phokaia, 170 (age uncertain), which recalls the Attic inscriptional forms Φωκαΐς, Φωκαϊκός; Ἀθηνᾶς, Erythrai, 206 A 27, 29, B 20 (in the last example we have Ἀθηνᾶς Ἀποτροπαίας) after 278 B.C.; Ἀθηνᾶς, Samos, 216 (before middle of fourth cent.). Ἀθηνᾶς is not certainly Ionic, since this document may contain an admixture of Attic.[2] The above list, so long as it is not augmented by more certain proofs of the appearance of A(I), makes for the conclusion that in Asiatic Ionic intervocalic α from αι is not frequent. Ἀθηναίη is attested in Halik. 240 A 3, 241, Chios, 173; metrical inscr. 265 (unc. loc.); Erythrai, 200, 204_{32}, Priene, 142; αἰεί in Halik. 240 A 6, and so all editors except Ruehl, in 238_{37}. ἀεί, Iasos, 105_{10} (Attic); Φωκαιεύς, Eryth. 207 (not much older than 100 B.C.).

In the *poets*, whose authority stands second only to that of the inscriptions, we do not find any evidence beyond that presented by Αηθαίου, Anakr. 1_4, with αι short. γεραϊούς, Tyrt. 10_{20} (cf. Tyrt. frag. 17), is called in question by Bergk, though the αι is found in all Mss. αἰεί appears Tyrt. 5_5, Mimn. 1_7, Sol. 13_4, Theognis more than 20 times; Sim. Amorg. 1_4, 7_{65}; the poetical αἰέν, Xenoph. 1_{24}, Theog. 631, etc.;[3] αἰῶνος, Anakr. 112_4; καιετός, Archil. 86_2 (epod.). Ἀχαιίης should be expected, and doubtless is the correct form, Sim. Amorg. 23, for Ἀχᾱΐης (Fick, B. B., XI, 269), which is due to an Attic scribe. Cf. Ἀχαϊκ[ά], C. I. A., II, 723_3.

[1] Ἀθηνάα in Attic inscriptions of the sixth and fourth centuries; cf. Alkaios, 9, Theokr. 28_1.

[2] Ἀθηνᾶς in Attic prevails after 362 B.C. in inscriptions.

[3] ἀένναος, Hdt. I, 145, as *v. l.*

Digitized by Google

In *Herodotos* the chief difficulty as regards settling the question of the occurrence of α for αι is presented by αἰεί. Proper names in -αιεύς preserve the ι except in Φωκαεύς, in seven passages, according to Stein, though the same editor adopts Φωκαιεύς in thirteen cases. Φωκαεῖς, Bechtel, No. 170, Φωκαιεύς, 207, are of doubtful authority,[1] the latter at least being very late.

Nouns and adjectives in -αιη, -αικός, -αιίς, fall into line. Θηβαΐς, II, 28, etc., appears to be correct, since a Θηβαιεύς is defensible solely on the ground of analogy.

αἰεί is Stein's reading, though the Mss. are shaky in the extreme. Stein's eclecticism dictates αἰεί, but ἀείναος. ἀεί may be West Ionic, but scarcely Asiatic Ionic. αἰετός is certainly the genuine reading in Hdt.; and αι does not become α in this word in the Attic inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries. ἐλαίη and congeners, κλαίω Theog. 931, 1041, 1132, Archil. 13, 20, and καίω do not admit the α form (Theog. 1145). From the stem καϝ we have λυχνοκαΐη, πυρκαΐη. On the interrelation of καίω and κάω, see Wackernagel, K. Z., XXV, 268; Brugmann, Gr. Gr., § 18, 54.

78. Ionic AI = A of other dialects.

ἑταῖρος is the Ionic form. Cf. ἑταιρήϊος, ἑταιρηΐη, in Hdt. Hdt. has ἑταῖρος, so too Theog. 643. ἕταρος is epic alone, though claimed as Ionic, without any chronological distinction, by Greg. Corinth., p. 457. See Hinrichs, H. E. V. A., p. 90.

παραιβάτης, an Ionic form, Ψ 132. An Attic inscription, C. I. A., I, 5, 1 (500–456), has παραιβάτης. Attic cult documents are colored by Ionisms to a limited extent.

αἴδασμος, Chios, 183 A 30, B 30, is an unexplained form for ἄδασμος.

NOTE. — ἰθαγενής is the Herodotean form, not ἰθαι-, as *P. R.* II, 17.

79. AI = A(ι).

Φαιέννου, Thasos (Th. L. 18 C 5), Παμφαίης, Th. L. 19 A 6, Δαναίη, Miletos, 99, from Δανάη Ξ 319 in a passage held by some to be an Ionic insertion. The myth of Danaë is referred to nowhere else in the Iliad. Hekataios, 358, has Δανᾶ < Δανάη. Another instance of αι for α is suggested by Bechtel, *Thas. Insch.*, p. 28: ι 222, ναῖον δ' ὀρῷ ἄγγεα πάντα, Arist.; Mss. νᾶον. Cf. ἐννεία, Zeleia, and other forms, *sub* EI, § 90.

[1] Sappho 44, has Φωκάας.

Digitized by Google

80. *Varia.*

Note on AI = H.

1. There is no interrelation between η and αι in Ἀλθημένης, Thasos (L), 4_3 B, compared with Ἀλθαιμένης, similar to that existing between ἥμισυς and Aiolic αἰμισέων, Coll. 213_9. The η of Ἀλθημένης is that of ἀλθήσκω, ἀλθήσομαι; see Bechtel, *ad loc.*

2. αι in ἐξαιθραπεύοντος, Mylasa, 248, is referred by Lagarde (Gesammelte Abhandl. 70) to Avestan ṣ̌ōithra-, ἐξατράπης and ξατράπης to Old Pers. khšath'apāvā (Lagarde, p. 68, Le Bas, Voy. Arch. III no. 388).

3. Archil. 3, δαίμων = δαήμων. The latter is derived from δαιήμων.

81. EI.

The diphthong EI will here be treated under the divisions —

I. Genuine EI = pan-Hellenic and proethnic EI.

II. Spurious EI (monophthongic) = Attic αι, Doric η.

Doubtful cases will be considered at the close.

82. Note on the orthography of Ionic inscriptions. Confusion between E and EI as representatives of the two EI's is of not infrequent occurrence upon Ionic inscriptions antedating the year 400. After that period monophthongic EI was gradually diphthongized.

1. Genuine EI represented by (α) EI.

δυνάμEI, Teos, 156 B 31.

EIδώς, Teos, 156 B 22, 25.

EI, Halik. 238_{31}.

ΠEIθοῦς, Thasos, 70.

(β) by E rarely.

ποιήσEαν, Teos, 156 B, 30 (but here ι has been dropped).

Eπεν, Didyma, Roberts, I, 139. Cf. Meisterh.[2] p. 135.

Ἀριστοκλεδ[ης], Styra, 19_{12}.

Νεοκλεδης, Styra, 19_{265}.

2. Spurious EI represented (α) by E.

προσέρδEν, Thasos, 68.

φεύγEν, Halik. 238_{37}.

ἐπικαλEν, Halik. 238_{45}.

ὀφείλEν, Thasos, 71_{11} (fourth century).

In Attic the last examples of E for spurious EI date from 350–300.

(β) by EI rarely.

EIχον, Halik. 238_{30}.

Digitized by Google

Instances of the writing of εἰμί, etc., will be given § 93. The diphthongization of the ει of εἰμί may be traced back as far as the sixth century in Attic.

83. I. Genuine EI.

In radical syllables, *e.g.*, Φειδύνων, Styra, 19_{326}; Φειδίλεω, Kyme, Rob. I, 174; Μείδων, Styra, 19_{68}; Τειχιούσσης, Miletos, 98, etc.

The following words call for special attention:

1. τει in ἔκτειστν, Zeleia, 113_{17}, ἐκτείσωσι 113_{35}, the future and aorist of τίω(ῐ) being τείσω and ἔτεισα:[1] Τείσαρχος, Styra, 19_{311}; Τείσανδρος, Smyrna, 153_{14}; Τεισικράτης, Thasos (L), 17_{6}, 19 B 3; Τεισίμαχος, Halik. 240_{11}. Similar forms occur in other dialects (*Diphthong* EI, p. 17, A. J. P., VI, 443). Names in Τῖσ- are itacistic, but not so those in Τῖμ-. It is better to assume a root *qāi*, whose weak form is *qī* in τιμή, rather than to hold that case-levelling has produced Τῖμ: Nom. τείμᾱ; Gen. τῖμᾶς, whence τῖμή, through remembrance of the long penult of the nominative and not with *nebentoniges ī* (K. C., p. 234). See § 65 and Schmidt's *Neutra*, p. 396.

2. The ει of ὀφείλω is genuine, despite the pair ὀφέλλω: ὀφείλω (with different significations); ὀφΕΙλέτω, Chios, Rob. I, 149 A 14, ὀφΕΙλόντων, *ibid.*, l. 17, so ὀφΕΙλΕν, Thasos, $71_{9\text{-}11}$. EI is also attested, C. I. A., 40_{14}, I, 58, 324 A 52, whereas we have E, C. I. A., I, 32 A 3_{8}, B 22, 41_{3}. See Johansson, D. V. C., p. 212.

3. ἐνεῖκαι and connected forms (ἐνήνειγμαι, Hdt. VIII, 37): ἐν]ΕΙκάντων, Chios, 174 B 4. The ει formation occurs in Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Theokritos, Kretan, Boiotian, Aiolic. See Baunack, Gortyn, pp. 56 ff. Other theories are registered by Meyer, Gramm., p. 287; to which add Fick, G. G. A., 1883, p. 590, Meisterhans,[2] p. 146. See § 91.

84. Genuine EI in other syllables.

On τουτΕΙ, νηποινΕΙ, ἀσπονδΕΙ, etc., cf. section on *Adverbs*, etc.

The ει of Διειτρέφης, Keos, 44 B 12, is from a stem διϝο. Cf. Διειτρέφης, C. I. A., I, 402_{2}, 447 III, 53; Kypr. Διϝείθεμις, 60_{21}. In Homer, Zenodotos read διειπετής for the vulg. διῖπετής. Cf. Δημπέτης (perhaps), Styra, 19_{181}.

On ει in suffixes >εσι and εϝι, see § 45, 46, and under *Declension* (-ες and -ηυ stems).

[1] Arkad. τείω is a neologism. Brugmann, *Grundr.* I, § 314, doubtfully suggests that ἔτεισα is from *ἔτησα.

Digitized by Google

85. Genuine EI from ε + anaptyctic ι.

Ionic examples of this phenomenon are εἴσχηκα, Smyrna, Berl. Monatsberichte, 1875, 554, l. 7; εἰσχήκατε, Erythai, Μουσ. κ. βιβλ. 1875, p. 99; παρείσχηται, Olbia, C. I. G. 2058, a 4, — all late inscriptions.

86. Genuine EI from EF-.

I must not be taken to be the direct representative of ϝ. In some cases it may be a minimum vocalic sound, found in a weak syllable, as survivor of a tonic vowel. Many of the words to be classed here are not of transparent structure, *e.g.*:

εἶρος (Hdt., Hippok., Hom.) is either *ἐ-ϝῖρος, with ϝέριον as strong form, or *ἐϝρος = *ἔρρος. G. Meyer, Gramm., § 101.

εἰρήνη, Eryth. 199_9, 203_8, etc., < ἐϝῖρ-. If from ἐϝρήνη, we would expect ἠρήνα in Doric, ἐρρήνα in Aiolic, which never occur. Spitzer, *Arkadischer Dialekt*, p. 20, attempts unsuccessfully to explain the dialectal interrelation of ᾱ and η after ρ in this word. I cannot adopt Meister's conclusions (G. D. II, 93).

87. Genuine EI from HI.

πλεῖστος from I.E. plēisto- < plēis- by proethnic contraction of ē and *i*. The Ionic dialect offers no trace of πλῆστος, on which see Meister, G. D. II, 95, and Schmidt, *Neutra*, p. 413. On πλεῖον, etc., see § 88.

NOTE. — ηι does not become ει in the subj. in the forms ἀποκρύψει, Ephesos, 145_4, ἐπάρει, 145_2; κατάξει, Teos, 156 B 37, ἐκκόψε[ι], 156 B 38, ποιήσει, 156 B 39. The forms in -ει are genuine and original subj. See Schulze, Hermes, XX, 491 ff. On ει < ηι in subjunctives, see under HI, § 107.

88. E *from* EI *before vowels.*

Genuine EI suffers the loss of its second element, as does AI (above, § 77), though not frequently.

West Ionic: Chalkidian vases in Roberts, 189 F, Αἰνέης; Κλεώ, C. I. G. 8369; Θάλεα 8412; Σπεώ 8354.

Asiatic Ionic: ποιήσεαν, Teos, 156 B 30; δασέαν, Miletos, $100_{2,6}$.

Other examples, as Fritsch (V. H. D., p. 41) states, are not free from the suspicion of not being pure Ionic. Ποσιδέου, Chios, 177_{11} (about 300 B.C.), Smyrna, 153_{32} (this name with ει, Perinth. 234 B 34, Th. (L.), 10_{10}); Ἡράκλεος, Eryth. 206 A 12; Ἡρακλεώτου, 206 A

Digitized by Google

38, -εώτης 206 B 26 (after 278 B.C.); Ἡρακλεώτης, Halik. 241, in a metrical inscription. Meisterhans,[2] p. 34, quotes Ἡρακλειώτου from C. I. A., I, 65_1, before 403 B.C.; Ἡρακλεώτην, II, 613_{15} (298 B.C.), cf. Ἡρακλέος, Hdt., Greg. Cor., § 36, Meerm. 649; δωρεάς, Ephesos, 147_{15} (300 B.C.); ἱερατέαι, Eryth. 206 C 13,—the only instance of this form, while there are ten of ἱερητεῖαι. ἱερῇ, Pantikap. 123 (third cent.), Ephesos, 150 (late), from ἱερε(ί)η; cf. Hdt. ἱρείη, I, 175, V, 72. ἐξώλεα, πανώλεα, Bechtel, 263 (Lykian), may be Ionic or Attic.

Nouns in -ειο = ηιο and nouns and adj. from sigmatic and ηυ stems generally retain ει in all branches of Ionic.

The form δασέαν in Miletos 100_2 an inscription, dating, according to Rayet, from the fifth century, is apparently as complete a parallel to δασέα in Hdt. as might be desired; and the more interesting, on account of the fact that Hdt.'s dialect is in some measure similar to that of Miletos. Greg. Corinth. p. 440, says τῆς θηλείας τὸ ῑ ἐξαιροῦσι, καὶ ἐπὶ πάσης πτώσεως τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν, quoting Hdt. for θηλέων and θηλέῃ. Following are the forms adduced from Hdt., with the evidence from other quarters of Ionic. Other examples of the -ει- forms from the pseudo-Ionists are given, *sub* Declension.

Digitized by Google

Table A.

MSS. OF HERODOTOS.	HOMER.	LYRIC POETS.	OTHER IONIC PROSE WRITERS	INSCRIPTIONS.
βαθέα	-έα only O 606, Π 766, Φ 213 cf. Fick *Ilias* 84, 86, 380	βαθεῖαν Sim. Am. 7_{66} cf. Sim. Keos 37_{9}	βαθέαν Arrian 27, 33	
βαρέα	βαρεῖα	Sim. Keos 117		
βραχέα		βραχεῖα Sim. Am. 7_{75}		
δασέα	δασεῖα	δασεῖαν Hipp. 19_{2} δασείῃσιν 19_{3}	βραχέῃ Aret. 28 βραχεῖα Demokr.	δασέαν Milet. $100_{2,6}$ δασείης Zeleia 114 E
εὐρέα	εὐρεῖα		εὐρέη Euseb. Mynd. 63 εὐρέαι Hippokr. ΠΤΚ 6, 9	
ἡμίσεα				
θήλεα	θήλεια, θήλεας		θηλέην Luk. Syr. 15, 51 θήλεας 54 (θηλείης 27 Mss.) Arrian 14	
ἰθέα	ἰθεῖα		ἰθείῃ Demokr.	
ὀξέα	ὀξεῖα. Λ 272 ὀξέαι not probable.		ὀξέων Hippokr. ΠΔΟ 2	
πλατέα		πλατεῖα Bacchyl. 37	πλατέας Ktesias πλατείην Arrian 16 (Mss.)	
ταχέα	ταχεῖα	ταχεῶν Theog. 715		
τρηχέα	τρηχεῖα	Τρηχείης Hipp. 47_{2} τραχεῖαν Sim. Keos 163	τρηχέα Arr. 21; τραχεῖα Herch. τραχείης *Vita Homeri* 18	[τρηχῆαν Kaib. 237 Smyrna II. or I. cent. B.C.]
δριμέα	δριμεῖα		δριμέα Aret. 204	

Digitized by Google

A probable support is given to the Herodotean adj. in -*έα* by the Homeric Ῥέα, *βαθέα*, *ὠκέα*, and by an occurrence of this formation in the lyric poets (*ταχεῶν*). It is therefore inadvisable to refer this adj. form to the influence of the later Attic writing *εα* (for the first time in an -*υ*- adj., 345 B.C.). Since the vowel following upon the last *ι* was a palatal, we may assume that the genitive -*είης* was the source of the expulsion, and the new form then extended its territory, creating an -*έα*. Cf. Johansson, B. B., XV, 184; but also K. Z., XXX, 405, where recourse is had to the assumption that these feminines are from -*εϝᾰ*, not from -*εϝιᾰ*.

I class together *πλέον* and related forms.

ι-less forms: *πλέον*, *πλέονι*, *πλέονα*, *πλέω*, *πλεόνων*, *πλέους*, *πλεόνως* (and *πλεῦν*, *πλεῦνος*, *πλεῦνα*, *πλεῦνες*, *πλεύνων*, *πλεῦνας*), in Hdt., according to Stein; *πλέον* Solon, 32_4, Phok. 4; Anax. 6; *πλέω*, Demokr. 92, Anax. 13; *πλέον* and *πλέου*, Melissos, § 14; *πλέονας*, Theog. 605; *πλέονεσσι* 800; -*πλεος*, Hdt. and Archil. 58_4; *πλέον*, Oropos, 18_4, Keos, 43_9; *πλέονος*, Keos, 43_5; *πλέω*, Miletos, 100_2. *πλέον*, *Syr. dea* 46.

Forms with *ι*: *πλεῖον*, Sim. Amorg. 2_2, and Theog. 606; *πλείους*, Hdt. I, 167 (?), and in Theog. *πλείονα* 702, *πλείω*, 907.

Hippokrates and Aretaios have both *πλεῖον* and *πλέον*.

πλεῖον lost its *iota* before any other form, according to Wackernagel, K. Z., XXIX, 144, because the *ε* bore the accent, while in other forms *ι* was tonic (*πλείων*).

Ἀμαλθέης, Anakr. 8 (for Bergk's Ἀμαλθίης), seems warranted in the light of Phokyl. Ἀμαλθείης 7_2. *σίοντα*, Anakr. 49, is probably tvisháti, and not to be written *σέοντα* (Fick) = tvéshati. Alkaios has *σείων* 22 (with *ει* reïnstated from the aorist), and *σέων* 26.

In the case of -*εσ*- stems, we have -*εος* = -*ειος* in the following cases in Hdt.: —

τέλεος, *τελεόω*, generally, but *τέλειον*, IX, 110, and Eryth. 204_{23}, *τελείοις* (about 354 B.C.), and in Homer and Demokritos *τελεώτατος*; cf. Kret. *ἀτέλεα*, Cauer, 119_{22}.[1]

ἐπιτήδεος, Greg. Corinth. p. 473. Fritsch, V. H. D., 43, prefers to derive the adj. from *ἐπιτηδεύω*, but denies in any case the correctness of the ending -*εος*, which is the reading of the Mss. in almost all instances.

ὑπώρεα, cf. *πανώλεα*, *ἐξώλεα* 263 (Lykia).

[1] *τέλεος* in fifth and fourth centuries in Attic inscriptions; *τέλειος*, second century B.C.

Digitized by Google

ἐπέτειος is now written by Stein.

ἀφνεός, Theog. 188, 559.

Ἡράκλεος, Hdt. IV, 43, 152, 181, VIII, 132, as in Erythrai, 206 A 12 (after 278 B.C.). Ἡράκλειος is the best attested form in Hdt., appearing also Erythrai, 201_{17} (before 350 B.C.).

[illegible]νογενέην, Arrian, *Ind.* 8.

[illegible] *in adjectives from other stems.*

[illegible]ς, χήνεος, οἴεος, αἴγεος,[1] may have existed side by side with the -ε[illegible]rms (ἡμιόνειος, μήλειος). Ἀριμάσπεα and Ὑπερβόρεος need not be [illegible]ected with Fritsch, V. H. D., 44 (Fick, Ilias, 551 ff.). ἀδελφεός in [illegible]dt., Lokrian, I. G. A. 321 A 7, B 4, 22, and in the letters of Hippokr. 17_{29}, $27_{20,34,35}$.

Mimnermos, 11_{6}, κείαται, has, like Attic κείωνται, C. I. A., II, 573_{10}, a later ει.[2] In Hdt. and Hippokr. κέεται, ἐκέετο, κέεσθαι, with ε from ε(ι) regularly. Δέαλκος, Thasos, 83_{6}, seems to have lost *iota*. Cf. Δε[illegible]κος, Thasos, 81 B 14.

Expulsion of I from EIH.

Iota does not disappear in stems in -εσ-: ἀεικείη, ἀληθείη, etc. (above, § 45). εὐμαρέη seems to be supported, Hdt. II, 35, by all the [illegible]ss., by Greg. Corinth. *d. d. Ion.* § 119, and by Suidas, εὐμαρέη ἀπόπατος παρὰ Ἡροδότῳ, but cannot make stand against the overwhelming mass of counter-testimony.

Δεκελέη, Hdt., as Δεκελέεως, C. I. A., II, 733, B 6, from Δεκελειεύς, II, 660, 4. See Bekk. Anecd. II, p. 601, Steph. Byz., *s.v.* Δεκελεᾶθεν. Hdt. has also Μαντινέη, Μαρέη, Μαλέη.

Upon the expulsion of ι, contraction resulted in ἱερῇ, Pantikap, 123, Ephesos, 150; cf. Ionic ἱρείη in Hdt.; ἱέρεια, Keos, 48 (fourth cent.), as Z 300. The intermediate step between ἱερείη and ἱερῇ is represented by Kallimachos' Ἱερέη, epigr. 40. In Attic we may have ἱέρεια and ἱερία (Orestes, 261) by suffix exchange. The explanation of the form Ἑρμῆς is as yet too uncertain for it to be classed here. Apparently it is = Ἑρμε(ί)ης = Ἑρμείας. Ἑρμῆς in Homer is rare (but often in hymns). Herodotos has gen. Ἑρμέω; cf. Ἑρμέω, Chios, 180, where -ιεω seems an analogical formation.

89. EI from E + glide I (before a vowel) occurs before ο, ω, ου, α; as yet no examples before ε and η in Ionic.

δειόμενον, Oropos, 18_{36} (about 400 B.C.); cf. δείω[ν]ται, C. I. A., II, 119_{14}, about 340 B.C.; προσδείηται, C. I. A., II, 167, 43, 48, 334–

[1] Homeric αἴγειος, except ι 196.

[2] Cf. Λ 659, κέαται, and κατακείαται, Ω 527.

Digitized by Google

325 B.C.[1] Attic inscriptions of the fifth century have ε; and so elsewhere in Ionic: δέηται, Olynthos, 8 B 4; δέηι, Zeleia, 113_{39} (δεῖ, Teos, 158_{8}, § 173). Mimn. 2_{13}, ἐπιδεύεται has been unjustly expelled by Fick, B. B., XI, 253, in favor of an assumed ἐπιδείεται. δεύω is an Aiolic form (C. D. I. 214_{37}, 250_{6}, 281 A 19, B 26), and ἐπιδεύεται may be classed with other Aiolisms preserved by Ionic elegists. Trace of this form appear even in Mss. of Hdt. IV, 130 (ἐπιδευέες, where ἐπιδεέες is correct).

ἐννεία, Zeleia, 113_{30}, shortly after Granikos.

εἰάν, Zeleia, $113_{20,30}$; cf. C. I. A., add. nov. 14, B 11 (387 B.C.); add. 115 B 30, 47 (after 350 B.C.); add. 573 B 13, 18 (after 350 B.C.),[2] and in Epeirotic.

πόλει(ω)ς, Zeleia, 113_{19}.

Θε[ι]όωρων, Eryth. 206 C 12, is a probable conjecture, as a letter is certainly lost. Θεόφρων, 206 C 11, need not disprove this. θειόν = θεόν, *Priene*, 141, an inscription in Ionic orthography, but not Ionic in dialect. θειῶι, 167, Phanagoreia.

-εῖος, genitive of -ηυ- stems, called Ionic (and Lesbic) by Herodian, II, 674_{4} (Ἀχιλλεῖος, βασιλεῖος). No examples occur in Ionic literature or inscriptions. Hdt. βασιλέος, and so Ἀχιλλέος, Olbia, C. I. G. 2076 (late).

-κλείους, genitive. See list *sub* ΕΣ stems in § on Declension. See Meisterhans,[2] p. 36, and Dittenberger, Syll. p. 780, for other forms.

90. An ει that is never represented by η in other dialects, and which is nevertheless not strictly a genuine diphthong, appears to exist in κρεῖας by a probable conjecture of Hermann, Ananios, 5_{3}. κρέας, Hipponn. 77, Sim. Amorg. 24.[3] As in λειαίνω, Solon, 4_{35}, χρεῖος, Theog. 1196[4] (χρέος 205), ἀποπνείω, Tyrt. 10_{24}, this ει is a mere graphical representation of ευ<εϝ, and appeared originally only when a long syllable was necessary, a fact not comprehended by later transcribers. Cf. also δειδιότες, Theog. 764, δείδιθ' 1179 (δέδοικα 780), where δειδ = δεδϝ.

In εἰαρινός, Theog. 1276, Lukian, *S.* 49 εἴαρος (Ἐαρίνης, Styra, 19_{184};

[1] Cf. also ἐδειήθη, Lokris Ἀθην, I, 489.

[2] The oldest certain example of ε(ι) is Attic Νηλείως Ἐφ. ἀρχ. 1884, 161 (418 B.C.).

[3] The ι of this κρεῖας must not be confused with that of Hom. κρεῖον, which is that of the suffix (Skt. kravya). κρειῶν = κρεϝίων has the ι of κρεῖας.

[4] Unless this be from *χρη-ι-ος.

Digitized by Google

Ananios, ἔαρι, tetr. 5; Hdt. ἔαρ[1]; Theog. ἦρος 777), the ει is due to the development of the glide *iota*, the ground form being *ἠαρινός, cf. vēr from vēzr, old Norse vār. ἦρος seems to be from ἔαρος, rather than from *ἤαρος. Cf. § 147. Hom. εἰλάτινος (ἐλάτινος, Olynth. 8 B 3) is purely metrical.

In the cases where this intervocalic *iota* appears, we must, I think, distinguish two distinct classes.

1. Cases of ει in poetry, where the ει is a mere graphical expression, not made use of by the earlier poets at least, to represent ευ = εϝ; *e.g.* Hom. λείουσι.

2. Cases of the pure glide iota, as in εἰάν, ἐννεία, where ϝ has nothing whatever to do with the appearance of the ι, though in some of the words in question ϝ, as a matter of fact, did once exist; but at the period from which the forms date, cannot have left any trace of its former appearance.

At the present stage of our knowledge, I hold it best to keep the two classes apart, though thereby not wishing to deny that in certain special instances one class may overlap into the other.

91. ἤνεικα, ἐνεῖκαι, in Hdt. with an εικ, whose relation to εγκ is not perfectly clear as yet. Lukian follows well in the wake of Hdt., but Hippokrates and Aretaios have throughout the Attic forms. See § 83, 3, and under *Conjugation*.

92. Itacism.

See above, under Ĭ, Î, for instances of ει for ῑ (Τείμαρχος, etc.).

93. II. Monophthongal EI.

A few sample, and some of the most important, forms under each head will illustrate this characteristic feature of Ionic. On 4–13, see Solmsen and Wackernagel, K. Z., XXIX.

1. Spurious EI from ενϝ.

ξεῖνος: Ξεῖνος, Styra, 19 54, 76, 277, Ξείνων 19 279, Ξεινίων 19 402, Ξείνιος 19 74, Ξείναινος 19 73, Ξεινοχάρης 19 75, 278; Ξεινοκρίτης, Amorgos, 228; Ξεινόθεμις, Perinthos, 234 B 28, Φιλόξεινος 19 330, Τιμόξεινος 19 318, Πρόξεινος 19 280; Θευξεινίδου, Smyrna, 153 29, etc. Hdt. πρόξεινος, VI, 57, whereas

[1] ἦρι in Hdt. must be corrected. The form in Lukian cannot stand, unless it can be proved that he here imitates an epic, not a Herodotean, form. Hippokr. and Aretaios have no trace of εἶαρ, their Mss. fluctuating between ἦρ and ἔαρ.

Digitized by Google

Eustathios, quoting Hdt., uses the form πρόξενος. In the poets we have ει forms, Sim. Amorg. $7_{19,20,107}$; Archil. eleg. 7; 19_2; Theog. 521, etc. Lukian has ξεῖνος, though cases of ξένος occur. Arrian, 26, 28, has ξέν- ; and so, too, Aretaios and the *Vita Homeri*. In other pseudo-Ionic sources, though there is great fluctuation, the weight that Herodotos' unimpeachable ξεῖνος carries, may pardon the adoption of this form.

Attic ξένος in some relatively pure inscriptions: Oropos, 18_9; Miletos, 100_6; Eryth. 199_4; later documents, Thasos, 72_3; Eryth. 206 B 12; Ephesos, 147_{19}; Phanag. 165. In Solon, ξένος, 23_2, Theog., ξενίης 518, are to be classed together as epic reminiscences. ξένος in Attic must be derived directly from ξένϝος, not through ξέννος.

κεινός = Attic κενός (κενότερος), Wackernagel, K. Z., XXV, 260; G. Meyer, *Gramm.*, § 76.

στεινός = Attic στενός (στενότερος). Arrian has στεινός three times, στενός an equal number. Aretaios seems to have the vulgar form; cf. Hippokrates, ΠΤΚ 9, στενώτεραι.

εἵνεκεν perhaps = ἕμ + ϝεκα (Osthoff, *Perfect*, 334; Brugmann, *Gramm.*, § 13) in Hdt. (cf. on *Prepositions*). εἵνεκα: Sim. Amorg. 7_{118}; Theogn. 46, 730, etc. οὕνεκα, Theogn. 488, 854; Xenoph. 2_{19}; Solon, tr. 37. See Wackernagel, K. Z., XXVIII, 109 ff. *Vita Homeri* has ἕνεκα, ξένος, etc.

εἴνατος, εἰνακόσιοι, Wackernagel, K. Z., XXVIII, 132; G. Meyer, *Gramm.*, p. 379.

2. Spurious EI from ερϝ.

δειρή, Hdt. and Theog. 266.

πείρατα, Arch. tetr. 55; Solon, eleg. 16; Theog. 140, 1078, 1172. Skt. párvan.

εἴρομαι, *ask* (Greg. Corinth. *d. d. Ion.* § 73), appears to be a present formed from the aorist stem with prosthetic vowel (ἐ-ρ^ϝέσθαι).[1] εἰρωτάω, *ask*, in Homer, Theogn. 519, Hdt. III, 14; ἐρωτώμενον, I, 86, is rejected by Stein in favor of εἰρωτεόμενον; Thasos, 72_{12}, ἐπερωτῆσαι, Attic (300–250 B.C.); cf. C. I. A., II, 601_7. Attic inscr. have also ἐπερέσθαι.

εἰρύομαι, Hdt. See Leaf on A 216 (εἰρύω, *draw*, $\sqrt{\text{ϝερυ}}$; εἰρύομαι, *protect*, $\sqrt{\text{σερϝ}}$. Schulze, K. Z., XXIX, 235, holds to the view that εἰρύσαι is from *ἐϝερύσαι.

[1] So my *Diphthong* EI, p. 64, and also G. Meyer, *Gramm.*[2], p. 425. Or εἴρομαι as well as Homeric ἐρέω, ἐρέομαι, *ask*, and also Attic ἔρομαι, are based upon the transference of *ἔρευμι, *ἔρυμαι, to the Ω conjugation (ἐρέϝω, ἔρϝομαι; Solmsen, K. Z., XXIX, 64.

Digitized by Google

3. Spurious EI from ελϝ.

εἰλίσσω, Hdt. (cf. Attic εἰλικτῆρες) probably from $\sqrt{\text{ϝελϝ}}$.

4. Spurious EI from -ενσ- or -ενς.

The *sigma* may represent either I.E. *s* in a final syllable, or secondary (dialectal) σ = τι̯.

On εἰς, εἴσω, and the orthography in inscriptions, see under *Prepositions.* εἰσί = ἐντί, λυθείς < λυθέντς, χαρίεις < χαρίϝεντς, ἀ[πο]κτΕνει(ε), Teos, Rob. 142 B 11. μείς, Hdt. II, 82, gen. μηνός, Halik. 238_4. Oropos, 18_6. κένσαι, Ψ 337, > κέντσαι, for κεῖσαι, with the ν of κεντέω.

4 A. πείσομαι from *πένθσομαι.

5. Spurious EI from ερς.

κείρας, Paros, 67.

6. Spurious EI from ελς.

ἀγγεῖλαι, ἀποστεῖλαι.

7. Spurious EI from εμς.

ἐνείματο, etc.

8. Spurious EI from εσμ.

εἷμα[τ]ίο[ις], Keos, 43_2, with the ει of εἷμα. Cf. Andania, Cauer,[2] 47 16, 19, 20, 21, εἱματισμός, *ibid.* 15. Hdt. has ἱμάτον. Brugmann, M. U., II, 223 (cf. IV, 133), separates ἱμάτιον from εἷμα so far as to imply that itacism does not exist. That G. Meyer, *Gramm.*, § 115, Solmsen, K. Z., XXIX, 73, are incorrect in maintaining this view, is clear from Attic ἱμάτιον, C. I. A., II, 755, 8, 9 (349–344 B.C.), etc. We have double forms in εἱμάτιον and ἱμάτιον.

Medial εσμ is preserved by analogy in Ionic as in other dialects.

The orthography of εἰμί shows a fluctuation found in no other form in ει. All inscriptions, not otherwise dated, are earlier than 400 B.C.

With E.	With EI.
Kyme, 3, = Rob. 177.	Miletos, 98, = Rob. 138.
Kyme, Rob. 173, 185.	
Naxos, 25, = Rob. 27.	Theodos. 125, written IEMI (after 400).
Arkesine (Amorg.), 29 = Rob. 158 D.	
Prokon. 103_2, = Rob. 42.	Olbia, Rob. 163 A.
Samos, 214, = Rob. 155.	Kameiros, 256, Rob. 164.
Naukr. Rob. 132 A, E, G.	Naukr. Rob. 132 C.
Chalkidian, Rob. 175, 186.	
Asiatic Ionic, Naukr. Bechtel, 259.	

Digitized by Google

For a similar fluctuation in other dialects, cf. my Diphthong EI, p. 60. EIμί in Attic is as old as 570 B.C. (Cauer, 487), this proving that ει = η in this and a few other words had a tendency toward diphthongization at an early period.

9. Spurious EI from εσν.

The orthography of εἶναι in Ionic inscriptions shows the fluctuation in the representation of the closed ē sound.

With E.	With EI.
Halik. $238_{22, 24, 42}$ (fifth cent.).	Halik. $237_{27, 29, 36}$.
Erythrai, $199_{5, 10, 11}$ (after 394).	Thasos, $71_{5, 6}$ (fourth cent.) 72_{9} (300–250).
	Oropos, 18_{32} (about 400).
Keos, 43_{4}, ἐξεῖναι (fifth cent.).	Amphip. 10_{12} (about 350).
	Eretr. 15_{14} (fifth cent.).
	εἶν, Olynth. 8 A 3, B 5, 7 (betw. 389 and 383).
	ἐξεῖν, Orop. 18_{31}.

ἐπείνυσθαι, Hdt. IV, 64. Cf. καταείνυσαν, Ψ 135. εἴνυμι is not a direct descendant of ἔννυμι, but derived from a later *ἔσνυμι, brought into life through the influence of ἔσσω, ἔσται, etc.

κλεινός < κλερεσνός: κλΕνογένης, I. G. A. 396 (Keos). Ἄργεννον near Erythai is perhaps due to the Aiolic element in the neighboring Chios. Ἄργεννον occurs in Troas and Lesbos, ἀργεννός being an Aiolic word, Hinrichs (H. E. V. A., p. 56). Other traces of Aiolism are Πελινναῖον, name of a mountain in the north of Chios, and Φαιέννου, Thasos (L.) 18 C 5.

10. Spurious EI from εσλ.

χείλιοι = Aiol. χέλλιοι, Lak. χηλίοι.

χεῖλος < χέσλος. Windisch, K. Z., XXVII, 169.

11. Spurious EI from ενι̯.

According to Brugmann, Gr., § 54, Homeric εἰν is = ἐνι̯ + vowel. ἐνάλιος we find in Archil. 74_{8} (tetr.), εἰνάλιος in Theogn. 576.

NOTE. — Brugmann, Grundr., I. § 639 (cf. Johansson, D. V. C., p. 212), has no hesitation in referring the ει of ἀμείνων to compensatory lengthening (*i.e.*, ει is a spurious diphthong); and to make this ει of ἀμείνων a point of departure for that of κρείττων, μείζων where ε would have been in place.[1] ἀμεινό-

[1] The only way to reconcile Brugmann's view with the fact that EI is written on old Attic inscriptions, is to assume that genuine EI was monophthongized, which is directly opposed to Meisterhans' view (p. 16). Brugmann himself believes in such a monophthongization (Gr., § 15).

Digitized by Google

τερος occurs in Mimn. 14_9, Ἀμεινοκράτης, Mykonos, 92_{14}, ἀμΕΙνον, Rob. 159 a, Amorgos.

12. Spurious ΕΙ from ερι̯.

ϝείρω *say* < ϝερι̯ω. Ionic εἰρέθην, Hdt. IV, 77, 156, etc. < ἐϝερέθην, Attic ἐρρήθην < ἐ-ϝρή-θην.

ναυστείρης, Styra, 19_{264}, Homeric στεῖρα or στείρη, A 482, β 428 and nowhere else (*Dipth.* ΕΙ, p. 65). Theog. 757 ὑπειρέχοι with ὑπείρ, as in Hom., < ὑπερι̯ before an initial vocalic syllable. ὑπειρόχους (Hdt. V, 92 η), adopted by Stein, is alien to the form usually accepted by the historian, and can be defended solely on the assumption of ποικιλία in the Herodotean dialect.

94. ΕΙ *of doubtful origin.*

Σειλήνη, Paros, 66, a late inscription with ει not in accord with the common Attic-Ionic form (Sappho, σελάννα; Doric, σελάνα; Archim. σελήνα).

Εἰλειθύει, Delos, 56_{50}, Paros, 66 (Εἰλειθυίηι). See Baunack, *Studien*, I, 69.

Εἰθύμαχος, Styra, 19_{39}. See § 67.

Τειρεσίας. Cf. τείρεα, Σ 485 (< τέρας, cf. γέρεα, Miletos, 100_7).

κεῖνος, written κΕνος, Teos, 156 A 4, 5, 11, 13, 156 B 28, 39, but with ΕΙ, 156 B 7; ἐκΕΙνος, Mylasa, 248 A 16 B 15, C 19. Prellwitz rightly holds that the ει is a monophthong, and divides ἐ-κεῖ-ενος: his proposed etymology, B. B., XV, 155.

95. ΟΙ.

This seems to have been pronounced as a genuine diphthong. Bechtel, *Ion. Inschr.*, p. 37, has refuted the view that in Styra οι was pronounced as ü, and that the dialect of Styra was herein influenced by the Boiotian change of οι to υ, *i.e. ü.* Μέτυικος, 19_{70}, may or may not be correct; but in the fifth century, the period of this leaden tablet, Boiotian οι had not abandoned the old diphthongal pronunciation of οι. Cf. Blass, *Aussprache*,[3] p. 57.

Digitized by Google

96. Antevocalic OI = O.

See above for A(I), E(I) in Ionic.

A. In inscriptions.

West Ionic.			
Εὐβοεύς, Styra, 19_{38}	V	ἐποίει, Eretria 14	V
		ἐποίησε, Adesp. 21	VI
		ἐποιησάτην, 265 (Euboia or Island Ionic)	V

Island Ionic.			
ἐπόει, Delos, 57	II	ἐπ[ο]ίησεν, Naxos 26	500
ποε(ῖ), Thasos, 72_4	300–250	[π]οιεῖν, Keos, 43_{21}	end of V
		Εὐκοίης, Keos, 44 B 9[1]	IV?
		Ποιασσίων, Keos, 47_2	IV
		Ποιᾶσσαν, Keos, 47_{10}	IV
		θαυματοποιός, Delos, 55, 3	270
		ἐχσεποίησεν, Paros, 58	VI
		ποίημα, Paros, 60 (metr.)	V
		εὐνοίας, Thasos, 72_6	III

[1] Cf. κοιᾶται, G. G. A., 1883, p. 119.

Asiatic Ionic.			
ἐξεποίησ', Abdera, 162 (metrical)	V	A. Before η, ει.	
		ἐποίησε, Miletos, 94	VI
ποήσασθαι, Eryth. 199_{13}	394 pre-Rom.	ἐποίειν, Miletos, 95	VI
ἐπόει, Samos, 222		ἱεροποιῆι, Miletos, 100_6	400
		ποιεῖ[ν], Didyma Rob. 139	V?
		[π]εποιήκασιν, Iasos, 105_4	end IV
		ποιήσεαν,[1] Teos, 156 B 30	470
		ποιήσει, Teos, 156 B 39	470

Digitized by Google

ASIATIC IONIC — *continued.*

		ποιήσας, Teos, 158_{14}	II or I?
		ποιήσει, Chios, 174 A 12	V
		ποιῆι, Chios, 174 C 9	V
		ποιῆται, Chios, 174 C 11	V
		[ἐποίησεν, Chios?] Rob. p. 64	V?
		ἐποίησεν, Eryth. 207	II
		ποιήσειν, Sam. 221_{24}	322
		ἐποίει, Sam. Rob. 157	V
		νεωποιήσαντες, Sam. 222	pre-Rom.
		πόιησεν, Halik. 241 (metr.)	?
		ποιήσαντες, Myl. 248 A 12	367/66
		ἐποιήσαντο, Myl. 248 A 13	367/66
		ποιήσαντος, Myl. 248 B 6	361/60
		ἐποιήσαντο, Myl. 248 B 12	361/60
		ποιήσασθαι, Myl. 248 C 9	355/54
		ποιησαμένη, Myl. 248 C 16	355/54
		ἐποίησεν, Adesp. 264	VI
		οἴην, Chios, 183 A 46	350
		Οἴην, Eryth. 201_{27}	IV
		αἰδοίην, Adesp. 264 (metr.)	VI
		B. Before ο.	
		τειχοποιοῦ, Kyzikos, 111_{6}	IV
		ποιοῖ, Teos, 156 A 2	470
		ποιούντων, Teos, 158_{18}	Hellen.
		ἱεροποιοῦ, Eryth. 206 ABC (12 times)	278
		Ἔνδοιος, Adesp. 264.	VI
		C. Before α, αι.	
		νεωποίας, Ephes. 147_{15}	300
		νεωποίας, Halik. 240_{6}	450–400
		εὐνοίαι, Ephes. 147_{8}	300
		εὔνοιαν, Samos, 221_{8}	322

ποιέω is the word most frequently affected by the change.

Cf. ποῇς, Theokr. 29_{21}; ἐπόησε, Theokr. 29_{24}, Aiolic, 218_{9}; ποήσασθαι, Aiolic, 281 A 19, B 24; πόη = ποιῇ, 238_{6}; ποήσω, 281 B 54;

Digitized by Google

ποείμενος, 305_8; Arkad. ποέντω, 1222_9; other examples, G. Meyer, *Gramm.*, § 155.

B. *Lyric Poets.*

Anakr. ἀδοϊάστως 95, ἐπτοήθη 51_3 (ἐπτοίηθεν χ 298, πτοιῶμαι, Mimn. 5_2).

C. *Herodotos.* Cf. Fritsch, V. H. D., p. 45 ff.

Εὐβοεύς, VII, 156, VIII, 4, 19, 20; Εὐβοΐς, III, 89.

Εὐβοϊκός, III, 89, etc. In fact, Εὐβοιεύς is found in no Attic prosaist, and Εὐβοΐς only in poetry: Trach. 237, 401; Εὐβοΐς Trach. 74, Eurip., Herakl. 83.

εὐνοίη and προνοίη.

ποίη, as in Homer ποιώδης. Attic ποία is poetical, elsewhere πόα, as Sappho, 54_3.

ῥοιή, Homer ῥοιαί, Attic ῥόα (Greg. Corinth. p. 220, quotes ῥοιά as Doric).

στοή, according to Stein, III, 52 (*R* has στοιή); στοιά is poetic in Attic, στοά alone is found in inscriptions, στοιά is Doric (*D. S.*, 369_{25}).[1] Why Hdt. should use ποίη and ῥοιή, but στοή, is not clear.

φλοιός, IV, 67, also Homer and Attic.

χλόη, IV, 34, Stein; χλοι- in χλοιοῦσθαι, Galen, *lex. Hippokr.*, χλοιώδης, Hippokr.

ὁμοχροιίη has Mss. authority, I, 74, where Stein prefers -οίη.

ποιέω in Hdt. throughout.

φθόη is a medical expression adopted by Plato, perhaps from Hippokrates. Wackernagel's (K. Z., XXX, 268) objection to the hiatus is removed if we compare Skt. kshayá and apply Fick's law as to the interrelation of ι and *yod:* when the accent falls originally, as here, upon the final syllable, ι is expelled, *i.e.* becomes *yod.* Cf. Bechtel, Gött. Nachrichten, 1885, No. 6.

97. *Varia.*

1. There appears to be no certain instance in Ionic of οῑ for ο before a vowel (as in ὀγδοίης, etc.). κοῖλη, Mimn. 12_6 (Alkaios, 15_5), is a conjecture. It has not been shown that a κοῖλος arose in the manner assumed for γελοῖος ὁμοῖος (Hartel, *Hom. Stud.*, III, 41). A preferable solution is that κοϝιλος (κοϝ = cav-us) = κοῦιλος was represented graphically by κοίλος.

2. [Τ]ροιζήνιος, Iasos, 104_{29}, before 353 B.C., disproves the state-

[1] Also C. I. G., 2483_{21}, Astyp.

Digitized by Google

ment of G. Meyer, *Gramm.*, § 112, that this form (with anaptyctic ι before ζ) does not appear before the imperial period. Cf. Τροζάνιος, Roehl, 70_{13}, Schneider, *Dial. Megarica*, 39, Müllensiefen, *Dial. Lacon.* 88.

3. δεσπόνησιν, Kyzikos, Rob. 148 = δεσποίναις, if correct, is a unique form. The converse appears in Φιλοδέσποιτος, *Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor* (*Papers of the American School*, III, No. 218).

4. οι appears for εοι in the Herodotean οἶκας, οἰκός, with absence of reduplication, as in οἰκοδόμηται, I, 181, Heraklea, I, 137.

98. ΥΙ.

The second mora of the diphthong ΥΙ may disappear before a following vowel.

ὑός, Paros, 67 (late), Ηυός, 266, of uncertain provenance. Cf. υἱός, Δ 473, λ 270; δῦη, υ 286. ἀφύη, often used by the comic poets, may be an Ionic loan-form (G. Meyer, *Gramm.*, p. 36).

υἱός is found, Amorg. 35 epigr., Priene, 141 (in Ionic alphabet), 265, uncertain locality; Delos, 57 (cf. μυοσόβαι, B. C. H., VI, 32, 33). On υἱός in metrical inscriptions, cf. Allen, *Versification*, p. 71 ff., on ὑ(ι)ός in Attic, Meist.,[2] p. 47.

Diphthongs κατ' ἐπικράτειαν.

99. ᾶΙ.

ᾱι = pre-Hellenic *āi*, gave way to ηι at the earliest period of Ionic that can be reconstructed by us.

100. ΗΙ.

Whether ΗΙ is really a δίφθογγος κατ' ἐπικράτειαν in such forms as βασιλήιος is not perfectly certain (Blass, *Ausspr.*[3] 22, Johansson, B. B., XV, 182). Schulze, K. Z., XXIX, 252, writes βασιλῆος, and holds that ηι became η between the time of Hipponax and Herodotos.[1] See below, § 152.

101. Medial ΗΙ.

I. Retained before vowels.

In this category fall chiefly the derivatives in -ήιον, -ηίη = Attic -εῖον, -είη, from stems in -ηυ-. In dealing with the vexatious problem

[1] In Hdt. the correct form is ῆε, not ῆιε.

Digitized by Google

of the interrelation of these terminations it must be borne in mind that originally an -ηυ- stem yielded -ηιη or -ηιο-, except in the case of such feminines as had adjectival motion (§ 46); while sigmatic stems produced -ειη and -ειο-. This original mark of distinction has been obliterated to a great extent in all the dialects, and especially is this the case in Ionic. In the following § wherever ηι is written, this is regarded as ηϊ. The forms of the ηυ stems have been collected by Fritsch, V. H. D., pp. 9 ff.; *e.g.*, Hdt., ἀριστήιον, ἀρχήιον, ἱερήιον, μαντήιον, -ηίη (μαντείας, Tyrt. 4_2), πολιτηίη, πρυτανήιον, Prokon. 103 (V cent.); στρατηίη, ταριχηίη, χαλκήιον, etc. Also from -ηυ- stems nouns and adjectives in -ηιος, -ηιον, -ηιη, = Attic -ειος, -ειον, -εια. βασιλήια, δουλήιος,[1] ἐξοδηίη, κηρυκήιον, Ὀδυσσήιος, ἀρήιος. Mimn. has Νηλήιον.

In other Ionic prosaists we find that the -ηι- forms are not so prevalent as in Hdt.: θεραπείη, Lukian, *Syr.* 31, Aretaios often, Hippokr. ΠΚ 460, ΠΑ 2, Ε ΙΙΙ, 3, Π 1. θεραπηΐη occurs only in the letters: Hippokr. 15_7, 16_7, $17_{20, 23}$. -ηι- forms occur as follows: μαντηι-, Luk. *Syr.* 36, *Astr.* 8, 23, 24; πολιτηίη, Hipp. ep. 17_{32}; βασιληι-, Luk. *Syr.* 18, 25, *Astr.* 12, Arr. *Ind.* 3, 8, 39, Hipp. ep. $17_{34, 41}$; ἀρήιος, Arr. *Ind.* 7, 11, 12, Euseb. 2; παιδηίοις, Euseb. 2; ἱρήιος, Luk. *Syr.* 42, 58, 57, Arr. *Ind.* 18. The following have no variant in -ηι-: μοιχείη, δοναστείη, γοητείη, προφητείη, φαρμακείη, πρεσβείη, ἑρμηνείη. στρατηίη is the only example in the *vita Homeri.*

Fritsch's thoroughgoing examination shows that here and there the Attic forms have forced themselves into the Mss. of Hdt. In the inscriptions we meet with the following forms in ει where ηι would be Ionic: —

ἀρχεῖον, Iasos, 105 (end of third cent.).
πολιτεία, Zeleia, 114 ABC (late), Samos, 221_{27} (322 B.C.).
πρυτανεῖον, Kyzikos, 108 B (first cent.).
καπηλεῖον, Iasos, 104_{44}.
πορεῖα, Samos, 221_{21} (322 B.C.).

All these forms are due to Attic influence.

Furthermore, -ηιο- occurs (Attic -εῖο-) where there is no -ηυ- stem involved. Hdt. ἀνδρήιος, ἀνδρηίη, γυναικήιος, where Homer has, λ 437, γυναικείας, Phokyl. 3_2, γυναικείων (cf. Fick, B. B., XI, 272), Archil. γυναικεῖον, 9_{10}; ἐργαλήιον, ἑταιρήιος, -ηίη, Καδμήιος but Καδμείη, I, 166, Καδμεῖοι often in Hdt. μνημήιον, οἰκήιος -όω, σημήιον.

[1] Cf. Anakr. 114.

Digitized by Google

Stems in Â or O yield -ηιο in the later Ionists: —

οἰκήιος, Luk. *Syr.* 20, 22, 53, 54, 57, Arrian, *Ind.* 20 (elsewhere -ει-); ἀνθρωπήιος, Luk. *Astr.* 27. From consonantal stems we have ἀνδρήιος, Luk. *Syr.* 15, 26, 27, Euseb. Mynd. 56 (Hippokrates has -ει- always); γυναικήιος, Luk. *Syr.* 15, 27, 51, Arrian, *Ind.* 8, Aret. 60, 61, 62, 285 (Hippokrates -ει-, and also Euseb. Mynd. 54); σημήιον, Luk. *Syr.* 15, 17, 49, *Astr.* 4, 7; Arrian, *Ind.* 28. Here Hippokrates and Aretaios follow the Attic rather than the Ionic standard. We have here a line of distinction drawn with tolerable distinctness between the medical writers and Herodotos, Lukian, and Arrian. Arrian, *Ind.* 10, has furthermore μνημήια, 10, but θήρεια, 17, 24, and Αἰθιοπείῳ, 6.

And again, -ηιο- = Attic -ειο-.

ἀνθρωπήιος (and -ειος), βορήιος, Εὐρωπήιος, κηλωνήιον, Φοιβήιος, φοινικήιος (φοινικήια, Teos, 156 B 38, 470 B.C.), ἀγγαρήιον, λαισήιον, Ἀλήιον, Λιμενήιον. Hipponax, 57, has τροπήιον from τροπέω, an Ionic verb.

Upon inscriptions ει for ηι in

Ἀνδρείων, Eryth. 206, B 48, 56 (278 B.C.).

οἰκειότητος, Ephesos, 147_4 (300 B.C.).

οἰκεῖοι, Lykia, 263 (perhaps an Attic form).

Εὐφρονιεῖοι, Θαλεῖοι, Eryth. 206 B 46.

Λυκείου, Eryth. 206 A 20 (Steph. Byz. Λυκήιον).

ἱερητεῖαι, Eryth. 206 A 44, B 1, 45, 60, C 7; ἱερητειῶν, A 14, 36, ἱερατέαι, C 13; Priene, 144, ἱερατείης.

ὁρκυνεῖον, Halik. 240_{44} (fifth cent.).

The inscriptions have ηι in πρυτανήιον Prokon. 103 (600 B.C.), φοινικήια (above), ἱερήου, Oropos, $18_{33, 36}$ (see § 103); ἡμμνήιον and σπονδήιον, Paros, 62; Σαραπήια, Naxos, 28.

-ηιο- in Ionic has by analogy extended its sphere beyond that of the ηυ- stems in the class ἀνδρήιος and ἀνθρωπήιος. In no case is there any justification for the adoption of -ηι- even in such -ες- stems as yield abstract nouns, *e.g.* ἀληθηίη, which has been foisted upon Herodotos by the Aldine edition. The few instances of ηι=ει, are of late date. Ἀργήιος, Ditt. Syll. 421_5 (400–350), is, however, certainly on the stone, though it may be an error, as it dates from a period when there was a fluctuation in the orthography.

NOTE. — If it can be shown that there are stems in -ησιο-, which is still a moot point, such apparent anomalies as Aiolic κυπρογένηα, and Boiot. names in -γενειος, -μειξειος, may be cleared up. See Johansson, B. B., XV, 181. Ξενο-

Digitized by Google

κρατήια, Eryth. 208, is a hyper-Ionic form, and not to be regarded as an example of -ησια. That yod should lengthen a preceding vowel, as G. Meyer, *Gramm.*,[2] § 79, states, is of course out of the question.

Ξενοκρατήια is not to be classed with Delphic Καλλικράτηα, etc., where the η is a late graphical expression for ει. It is scarcely probable that a stem in -ησιο- should manifest itself so late as the first century B.C. when it is not beyond peradventure proved in the case of older forms.

NOTE 1. — ἀγγήιον without variant, Hdt. II, 121 β, δ, IV, 2, Lukian, *Syr.* 20, 48. This is the sole support for this supposed Ionic form. Keos, 43_{10}, with ἀ]γγεῖα, is not free from the suspicion of being Attic, though this form is undoubtedly Ionic too. Cf. ἀγγεῖον and κενεαγγείη in Hippokr. and Aretaios.

NOTE 2. — Feminines derived from masculines in -ευς have ει, not ηι. In Keos, 48, ἱέρεια; Pantikapaion, 123_3, ἱερῆ; Ephesos, 150, ἱερῆ. In Herodotos, the Mss. have generally ἱρείη, but occasionally the shibboleth of the Ionic ηι is disclosed (II, 53, 54, 55). Cf. also, βασίλεια, not -ηίη.

102. Medial ηι retained before consonants.

1. Masculine patronymics.

In but one case in Hdt., VIII, 132, Βασιληίδεω. Cf. [Β]ασιλείδης, Chios, 179_9, the same form on a Chian coin, *Denkmäler der Wiener Akad.*, IX, 322 (400–350). If Σελληΐδεω in Archil. 104 is correct, it is the only instance in the lyric poets, and Σκηβηίδης, Teos, C. I. G., 3064_{28} (late), the only instance in the inscriptions. In all other cases -ειδης, on which see below. Πηληίδης, attested by Greg. Corinth. *d. d. Ion.*, p. 377. Μηίων, Hdt. I, 7.

2. Feminine patronymics.

Hdt. Νηρηίδων, II, 50; Νηρηίσι, VII, 191; Βοιβηίς, VII, 129, not to be written ηϊ, a poetical form introduced by the grammarians. Doubtless -ήιδης and -ήις (-ῆς) are correct.

3. Dat. Plur. of $\widehat{\text{A}}(\eta)$ stems.

-ησι was the regular Ionic form in the fifth century in Hdt. and in the inscriptions. The last Ionic ησι of which we have any knowledge dates from 394 B.C. (Erythrai, 199_6). After this, αις is the normal use. See under *Declension*.

4. In compound names (two stems).

Δηϊδαμαντ-, Aigiale, 28 A.

Δηϊλέων, Smyrna, 153_{18}. Cf. Bechtel, *ad loc.*

Δηΐλλεος, Thas. (L) 7, B 9.

Δηΐαλκος, Th. (L) 3_4, 9_9.

Digitized by Google

Δηϊθράσης, Th. (L) 3 A 8.
Δηϊπέτης, Styra 19_{181}, perhaps.
Ἀρηΐθους, Th. (L) 14 B 2; 16_{7}.
Ἀρηϊφίλου, Anakr. 106.

5. Greg. Corinth. *d. d. Ion.*, p. 377, quotes κληϊσθέντες as Ionic. Μαρωνηιτέων, Maroneia, 196_{2}, though from the same period (before 400) we have Μαρωνειτέων, 196_{3}.[1] ηι, as augment, is preserved; *e.g.*, ἠιρημένους, Samos, 221_{35}.

103. II. Medial HI becomes H.

ἱερήου, Oropos, $18_{33, 36}$, about 400 B.C. Greg. Corinth. *d. d. Ion.*, p. 379, mentions ἱερήϊον as Ionic. Also Aiolic and Delphic.

A remarkable form is λητουργεῖν, on a Tean document, Ditt. *Syll.* 126_{73} (306–301).

104. III. Medial HI passes into EI.

(α) before vowels.

Here belong the forms mentioned under § 101, from inscriptions, from the lyric poets γυναικεῖον, Archil. and Phokyl., unless Fick's defence of the form as it stands (= γύναιον) holds good. [ἀ]γγεῖα, Keos, 43_{10}, while Hdt. has ἀγγήια, IV, 2; Homer, ι 222, ἄγγεα. Fritsch holds that ἀγγεῖον alone is correct, which is probable (cf. ἄγγος).

(β) before consonants.

In all masculine patronymics, except those mentioned § 102, Hdt., as Attic writers, uses -ειδης with but a single exception: Αἰγεῖδαι, IV, 149; Ἀριστείδης, VIII, 79–82; Ἀτρεῖδαι, VII, 20; Νηλεῖδαι, V, 65; Περσεῖδαι, I, 125; Ἀλκείδης, IV, 149. No Ionic inscription of the fifth century contains a patronymic form. Πιθείδης, Keos, 44 A 10, Ἀρι](σ)τείδης, Thasos, 77 A 9, Ἀριστείδευς, B 14, are all too late to be of moment, though they apparently support the general conduct of the patronymic in Ionic prose. Βασιληίδεω may well be correct despite the numerical weight of evidence against -ηιδης in Hdt. As Attic inscriptions of the fourth century have -ηιδης, the older form existing parallel to the younger -ειδης (to say nothing of the fifth century with its ΕΙΔΕΣ), so in Ionic we may assume the contemporaneous existence of both forms, though ηι may have been weakened to ει in the majority of instances. The Ionic dialect is tenacious of ηι (νηί, Πριηνηΐ, etc.). See § 102, and below, § 106, 107, 152.

[1] Cf. Hdt. Βορυσθενειτέων, IV, 17.

Digitized by Google

105. IV. Medial HĬ = EĪ.

This *metathesis quantitatis* was first proposed by Fick (B. B. XI, 267) on the score of Anakreon's four syllable Θρηϊκίη (96) by the side of Θρηκίη (49, 75), Hipponax' Θρηϊκίων 42 (ἐπ' ἁρμάτων τε καὶ Θρηϊκίων πώλων). Bechtel, *Ion. Inschr.*, p. 13, goes so far as to claim for Ionic and Attic that, wherever ει appears for ηι, ηι passed through the stage εῖ. On any view ει<ηι is found chiefly in Eretrian Ionic, since in Asiatic Ionic ηι lost its *iota* and did not become ει. From prose inscriptions we can scarcely expect proof, and even if we accept Θρεῖκίων, we are not compelled to extend this *metathesis quantitatis* over all the territory claimed by Bechtel. The parallelism of later λειτουργεῖν and τεῖ does not disprove the *vocalis ante vocalem corripitur* rule, or necessitate the hypothesis that in Ionic-Attic there was a middle stage, εῖ.

106. I. Final HI is retained.

(α) In the dative singular.

νηῖ, perhaps from νῇ from the analogy of νηός, etc. (Alkman has νᾷ according to Blass, *Hermes*, XIII, 25). On Πριη[ν]ῆι see under *Declension*.

(β) In the subjunctive (Island and Asiatic Ionic, but not generally in West Ionic). See under *Conjugation*.

The ι ἀνεκφώνητον is but rarely misplaced; *e.g.*, εἴηι (opt.), Teos, $158_{15, 30}$, (second cent.). Cf. the similar form on an old papyrus, Blass, *Ausspr.*[3] 48, and the confusion between εἴη and εἴῃ, H 340, Σ 88. εἴηι occurs on the papyrus that has θείηι.

107. II. Final HI = EI.

(α) In the dative singular of Ā(η) and -ηυ- stems.

For the forms from Euboian Ionic, see under *Declension*. The Herodotean βασιλέϊ, or βασιλεῖ, is due to the analogy of other cases. Ἄρει, found Sim. Amorg. 1_{13}, may be read Ἄρῃ; Ἄρει in Homer will readily yield to Ἄρεῖ, or Ἄρῃ (Φ 112, 431, B 479). Smyth, Diphthong EI, pp. 36, 42.

(β) In the subjunctive. Here we have to distinguish between (1) ει, an original form with short modal vowel (Schulze, *Hermes*, XX, 491 ff.).

Digitized by Google

κατάξει, Teos, 156 B 37,
ἐκκόψε(ι), Teos, 156 B 38,
ποιήσει, Teos, 156 B 39,
ποιήσει, Chios, 174 A 12,
ἀποκρύψει, Ephesos, 145, 1, 8,
ἐπάρει, Ephesos, 145_2,
} of the fifth century.

Cf. παραμείψεται, Mimn. 3, and also in Kretan (Baunack, *Studien*, I, 3; Bechtel, *Gött. Nachr.*, 1888, p. 402).

(2) ει < ηι in later inscriptions.

ἀναψηφίσει, Amph. 10_{19} (middle of the fourth century).

παρέλθει, Orop. 18_3,
ἀδικεῖ, Orop. 18_9,
ἐκτίνει, Orop. 18_{12},
ἀδικηθεῖ, Orop. 18_{14},
συνχωρεῖ, Orop. 18_{20},
παρεῖ, Orop. 18_{26}, = παρῆι < παρέηι;
cf. εἶ, 18_{34}, = ἦ,
ἐμβάλλει, Orop. 18_{40},
} between 411–402 or 387–377.

This ει < ηι is restricted in Ionic to the division of the West,[1] and in so far presents a proof of the progression of West Ionic and Attic along the same phonetic lines. There are no examples of this later ει from other portions of Ionic territory, and even in West Ionic the change has not been thoroughgoing (Olynthos, 8 A 6, B 17, ἴηι; B 14, δοκῆι). In the Kyklades and in Asiatic Ionic we have -ηι in the verb and nouns, except where ι has fallen off. The change of -ηι to -ει precedes in Amphipolis that of -ωι to -οι. In Olynthos, 8 A 6, Bechtel reads π]ολέμοι whereas we have -ωι in 8 B 4 (as well as -ηι).

108. Final H from HI.

Rarely, and then not in West Ionic, in the dative: Μάνη, Kyzikos, 108 (sixth century); τῆ βουλῆ, Eryth. 199_1 (394 B.C.); Μαλυείη, Eryth. 201_1 (fourth century); τῆ, Zeleia, 113_{15} (after 334); δημοσίη, Mylasa, 248 C 15 (355/4).

109. ΩΙ.

Final ΩΙ becomes ΟΙ only in Western Ionic. See under *Declension* for examples.

[1] ἐὰν δὲ δεῖ, Teos, Ditt. *Syll.* 126_7 (306–301), is Attic.

Digitized by Google

110. AY.

I find the following examples of *αο* = *αυ* (*α* + *υ*) in Ionic inscriptions. See below for *εο* = *ευ*.

αὐτοί, Priene, 144_9.

αὐτός, Chios, 184.

αὐτόν, Samos, 221_{14}.

αὐ[*τῶ*]*ι*, Eryth. 202_{11},[1] 263 (unc. loc.).

αὐτοῖς, Samos, $221_{21, 27, 28}$, Eryth. 203_2 (*ταῦτα*, l. 8).

αὐτούς, Samos, 221_{29}, Leros, 107_7.

ταῦτα, Leros, 107_{12}, Chios, 184, Eryth. $202_{10, 18}$, Samos, 221_{14}, Halik. 240_7 (the only example of the change in the dialect of Halikarnassos).

ἑαυτῶν, Samos, 221_{20}, 263 (Asiatic).

Γλαῦκος, Eryth. 209_1.

Ταυρέας, Eryth. 209_2.

Καυκασίωνος, Chios, 183 A 33; but Καυκασέ[α]ς, *B. P. W.*, 1889, p. 1195; cf. Eryth. 206 A 19.

Ναύλοχον, Priene, 141, an inscription not in Ionic dialect but in Ionic orthography. Ναῦκλος, Paus. VII, 3, 6, may be compared. Styra, 19_{264}, has Ναυστείρης; Olynth. 8 B 2, *ναυπηγησίμων*.

The graphical substitution of *ο* for *υ* is practically confined to Ionic territory. Kumanudis, Ἐπιγρ. Ἀττ. *ἐπιτύμβιοι*, 2597 (Αὐτοκρά[τ]ης), offers the only example from extra-Ionic territory. So far no evidence for this *αο* has been found in any portion of Ionic except that of the Asiatic mainland and adjacent islands.

This method of writing, however, does not of itself necessitate the conclusion that Ionic *αυ* was of different color from Attic *αυ*. Perhaps the Naxian AFYTO represents nothing more than an attempt at showing the pronunciation of *au* in a clearer manner than by AY, though we must not entirely exclude the suggestion that AFTO was meant, and AFYTO was a correction of the engraver (*ἀϝυτοῦ*). See Blass, *Aussprache*,[3] pp. 74 ff. This *αϝ* for *αυ* before a consonant is chiefly the property of Kretan, and sporadically of Lokrian and Korinthian.

111. AY = Ω.

See § 74, 126, for *τρῶμα*, *διφώσκω*, etc. The substitution of *ο* for *υ* is more frequent in Ionic than that of *υ* for *ο*. At present but one example of the latter orthography is known to us in Ionic: Μύ-

[1] About 350 B.C. No. 199, Eryth. (394 B.C.) has *αὐτῶι* twice.

Digitized by Google

λαυρος, Styra, 19_{133} = μυλωρός < -αορος. Cf. πυλαυρός = πυλωρός in Hesychios and the other examples quoted, G. Meyer, *Gramm.*, § 120. Hdt. III, 72, has πυλουρός with the *v. l.* πυλωρός. The grammarians went so far as to hold that αυ became ωυ in a suppositious form ωὐτός. Greg. Corinth. p. 419.

On OY from AY, see under OY, § 19, 124.

112. A from AY.

In late inscriptions υ is sometimes not written before a consonant. In Kaibel's *Epigramata* I find τοὔνομα τἀτόν 311 Smyrna, ἀτῶν 321, near Sardis, ἑατοῖς 340, valley of the Makestos, ἀτῆς, Sterrett, III, 235.

113. EY.

EO for original EY is not specifically Ionic, though this orthography was more extensively adopted by the Ionians than by any other Greek people.

1. Inscriptions of the fifth century.

βασιλεός, Chios, 174 C 10.

Κεφαλεός, Adesp. 266 ; see Bechtel *ad loc.*

2. Inscriptions of the fourth century.

φεόγειν, Amphip. 10_{3}.

φεογέτω, Amphip. 10_{24}.

φεόγο[υσιν], Chios, 185_{15}.

κοπρεόων, Chios, *B. P. W.*, 1889, p. 1195.

Εὐνομίδης, Miletos, 102, 1.

Εὐέλθων, Ephesos, 151_{3}.

Εὐπαθίδη(ς), Ephesos, 151_{4}.

Εὔχωρος, Ephesos, 151_{5}.

εὔνοιαν, Samos, 221_{8}.

ἐοργέτην, Eryth. 202_{5}.[1]

Εὐθύδαμος, Klazom., Le Bas, *Voy. Arch. Inscr.* III, 1, No. 86.

Λεοκαῖος, Klazom. 169_{3}. Cf. λεοκοῖς, Priene, 141, Ionic orthography as in Ναόλοχον.

Θέοττις, Chios, *Zeitschr. f. Numism.* XIV, 153, No. 3. Cf. Θεῦττ[ις], *l. l.* No. 4 = Becht. 194 (both fourth century).

3. Inscriptions of third century.

Εὐαγόρης, Thasos, 83_{3}; cf. 83_{4}.

[1] Bechtel's [εὐργ]έτην, Eryth. 199_{3}, is doubtful on account of αὐτῶι, l. 5, 12.

Digitized by Google

4. Of uncertain date.
Εὐρύδα(μος), Eryth. 209$_3$.
Σινωπεός, Sinope, 116.

NOTE. — Εὐπάμονος (Bechtel, *Ion. Inschr.*, p. 104), held by Boeckh (C. I. G. 2121) to be Phanagorean, cannot well be Ionic on account of -παμων = κτήμων, despite πολυπάμονος, Δ 433, which must give place to πολυπάμμονος of many Mss.[1] That εο = ευ is not confined to Ionic is clear from the following list: Εὔβωλος, Knidos, B. C. H. IV, 51; ἄνεο, Sunium, C. I. A., III, 73$_{12}$; Ὀρφεός, C. I. G. 7049; Ξεσῆρον, C. I. G. 3423, etc. See Hausoullier, B. C. H., II, 47 ff. Bechtel proposes to refer Εὐπάμονος to Knidos.

This εο is sporadic merely, and does not indicate that the pronunciation of ευ (*i.e.*, *e* + *u*) was any different in the localities where these forms were at home from that prevalent among all Ionic speaking Greeks. The following list shows the retention of ευ in words that in the above list had εο.

φεύγον[το]ς 13$_6$, Chalkis (?), found at Olympia.
φεύγων 13$_8$.
φεύγειν, Iasos, 104$_5$.
Εὐαγόρης, Thasos, 83$_4$.
Εὐ(π)ορία, Pantik. 121.
Λεύκων, Theod. (?) 127; Λευκ[ά]ριος, Styra, 19$_{124}$; Λεύκαρος, 19$_{389}$, Λεύκωνος, Phanag. 164.
εὐώνυμον, Eph. 145$_5$.
Εὐκράτου, Teos, 159$_3$.
On ευ for original εο, see also under *Contraction*.

114. ειο represents the diphthong ευ in Πίτθεος, Ephesos, *Num. Chron.* 1881, 16. εου stands for εο = ευ in Δεουνῦς, Maroneia, on a coin in Imhoof-Blumer's coll., referred to by Bechtel on No. 196. εου = ευ also in ʼΑριστοκλΕΟΥς, Thasos, 72$_1$, ΕὐρυσθένΕΟΥς, Samos, 217. Analogous is αου in Παουλλίνα, C. I. G. 6665, G. Meyer, § 120. Cf. Baunack, *Studien*, I, 72; B. B., II, 269.

115. β takes the place of υ in the late κατεσκέβασεν, Kyzikos, C. I. G. 3693. Cf. the same form C. I. G. 2015 (Gallipoli), and such forms as Boiot. εὔδομον 491$_{17}$, εὐδομέκοντα, C. I. G. 1845 (Korkyra).

[1] On Πολυπημονίδαο, ω 305, see Wilamowitz, *Hom. Untersuch.* 70, note.

Digitized by Google

116. Loss of Y in EY.

Before vowels *υ* is expelled as is *ι*. Scanty evidence of this phenomenon is furnished by the Ionic poets, Hipponax using *ευ* as a short syllable in *εὔωνον* 22 B (cf. Ἐωνυμεύς, Kuman. Ἐπιγρ. Ἀττ. *ἐπιτύμβιοι* 501_3), *θηρεύει* 22 A.

Inscriptions offer us but doubtful evidence: —

Ἐαλκίδης, Styra, 19_{183}, may be due to pure carelessness, as Blass suggests; at least we have Εὐαλκείδης, Thasos, 77 B 10, and Εὐαλκίδεω, Th. (L.) 3 A 10.

πρυτανέ(ο)ντος, Priene, 144_{10}, Ross' conjecture for *-εωντος* of the transcribers. Johansson, *D. V. C.*, p. 61, retains *-εωντος*, which he explains as = *-ηοντος*, comparing Lesbian *ἀδικήω*. This is, however, entirely unwarranted and has in fact been partially withdrawn by the same scholar, B. B., XV, 171.

βασιλέοντος, C. I. G. 2107 C, Pantikapaion, is not free from suspicion, since Ionic verbs in *-ευω* retain the *υ*[1]; *e.g.* *βασιλεύοντος*, Pant. 118, Mylasa, 248 ABC; *ἐξαιθραπεύοντος* and *παρεπρέσβευεν* 248 A 6; *θεραπεύεσθαι*, Oropos, 18_{21}; [*ἱερά*]*τευσεν*, Ephesos, 150; [*κιξα*]*λλεύοι*, Teos, 156 B 19; *μνημονεύοντος*, Halik. 238_{12}. There is no confusion here between *-ευω* and *-εω* verbs such as is discussed by Bredow, p. 81.

117. EY for AY.

πέτευρον, Oropos, 18_{42}, deserves notice as the Ionic form, found also Theokr. XIII, 13.

OY.

118. I. Genuine OY.

The diphthongal *ου* is generally represented upon inscriptions by OY or in a few cases by ΩY (ΩY = *οὐ*, and ΩYΔE = *οὐδέ*, Thasos, 68). OY in TOYTO, Halik. $238_{21, 23, 32, 35}$, TOYTOΣ, Amphipolis, 10_{29}. TOTO = *τοῦτο* 175 = Roberts, 150 (Chios), as occasionally in pre-Eukleidean Attic documents. APOΔHI, Teos, 156 B 17 = *ἀρούρηι* (?) is a vexatious spelling, though it is certain from Kyprian a·ro·u·ra· that the diphthong is genuine.

[1] *κατεσκέασε*, Magnesia (Μουσ. καὶ βιβλ. τῆς εὐαγγ. σχολ. Σμυρν. 1878, p. 46), is late. Cf. similar examples from Kyme (C. D. I. 311_{42}), Korkyra (C. I. G. 1838 B 6), Tenos (C. I. G. 2344_3); *κατασκεώσηται*, Delphi (W F), 263_8.

Digitized by Google

Genuine ου (*i.e.* *o* + *u*) is retained in Ionic as in other dialects. It occurs in ablaut forms, such as σπουδή and where υ has been joined to ο as in το-υ-το (particle υ).

119. II. Spurious OY.

The monophthongal ου is generally written O; *e.g.*: —
ὀρκΟν, Halik. 238_{26}, = ὀρκοῦν.
ΤΟρμοκράτεος, Prokon. 103_{2}.
ΒΟλεύοι, Teos, 156 B 24.
ΤιμΟχέοντες, Teos, 156 B 29.
ΤειχιΟσης, Miletos, 98.
Sporadically OY appears: —
ΤΟΥ, Amphipolis, 10_{13}, only case of this writing of τοῦ.
βαρβαρΟΥΣ, Teos, 156 B 26; in every other case of the accus. pl. ΟΣ.

120. Spurious ου before nasals.

μοῦνος < *μονϝο-ς, in Hdt. Archil. ep. 89_{4}, Sim. Amorg. 7_{24}, 14_{3}, Kall. 1_{21}, Solon, tetr. 33_{6}; μουνόκερα, Archil. 182; μούναρχος, Theog. 52. Attic forms in Solon, 24_{3}, 9_{3}. μοῦνος survives in late inscriptional poetry; *e.g.* *Arch. Instit. of America*, III, 341_{6} (Pisidia). Lukian, Abydenos, Aretaios, and other later Ionic writers have ου. Arrian varies between μοῦνος and μόνος, but the prevalence of the former in Aretaios and Hippokrates is so striking that there can be no question but that μοῦνος was accepted by all the pseudo-Ionists, except the author of the *Vita Homeri*.

γούνατα < γονϝ-, Hdt., Theog. 978, Tyrt. 10_{19}; Archil. tetr. 75, γουνυμένῳ; Lukian, *d. d. S.* 22, γούνων; Arrian 36, γόνατα. Hippokr. and Aretaios have the ου form.

NOTE 1. — The etymology of οὖν is uncertain. It is found Hipponax, 61, though there probably an Atticism. Sim. Amorg. 7_{45} has the genuine Ionic form. Wackernagel (K. Z., XXIX, 127) suggests that ὦν is extracted from μῶν. But μῶν is not Ionic. See § 75.

NOTE 2. — The principle that the exigencies of the Homeric verse cannot force any Greek form upon the ordinary dialect life of the people is fatal to a genuine Ionic οὔνομα, despite the fact that Lukian, etc., read it in their copies of Hdt. Stein writes οὔνομα, although the Mss. are in a constant flux, and ὀνομαίνω, ὀνομάζω. ὄνομα is the genuine Ionic prose form, found Oropos, 18_{39}, and so also in Ὀνομάστου, Kyme (Roberts, 174). ὄνομα is found in poetry, Theog. 246, Tyrt. 12_{31}; ὀνομαστός, Theog. 23, Ὀνομάκριτε 503. οὔνομα receives poor support from Sim. Amorg. 7_{87}, κοὐνομάκλυτον, a form alien to the genius

Digitized by Google

of the folk-dialect (misread from KON?). In Hippokrates, Lukian, *d. d. S.*, *de Astr.*, Arrian, Aretaios, **οὔνομα** prevails over **ὄνομα**, in the *Vita Homeri*, **ὄνομα** over **οὔνομα**; **ὀνομάζω** is the accepted form in later Ionic prose, while **ὀνομαστί** varies with **οὐνομαστί**.

121. Spurious OY before liquids.

1. -ορϝ-.

οὖρος, *mountain*, Sim. Amorg. 14_1, Theogn. 881; **οὔρεος**, etc.; Hekat. 172 **οὔρεα**, 173 **οὔρεσιν**. In Hdt. and Homer we find both **οὖρος** and **ὅρος**. The latter is the sole reading of the Mss. in about nineteen passages in Hdt. In other places where the word occurs, ABR have **ὅρος**, CPd **οὖρος**; whence Stein concludes, in opposition to Dindorf and Bredow,[1] that **ὅρος** is the genuine reading in Herodotos. Of the pseudo-Ionists, Lukian has **οὖρος**, *d. d. S.* 8, 28; Arrian has **οὖρος** but once (§ 11), **ὅρος** fourteen times. Hippokr., Aretaios have the **ο** form, as the *Vita Homeri*; **ὅρος**, Hekat. 44, 227, 344, Tyrt. 5_7, Archil. tetr. 74_9, ep. 115, Theog. 1292; Hipponax, 35, **ὀρείας** is attacked by Renner (p. 179), whose **πέτρας γέραιος** has not met with favor. The form **ὄρειοι** is certain, Arrian **Ἰνδ.** 17. **Ὀροβιή[της]** or **Ὀροβιε[ύς]**, Chalkis, Roberts, 172, an inscription not adopted by Bechtel. **Οὐράλιος** is an uncertain conjecture of Roehl, No. 394 = Bechtel, No. 42.

οὖρος ὁ, *boundary*, Chios, 174 A 6, 8, 10; **οὐροφύλακες** 174 A 15, 19; **ὅμουρος**, Halik. 240_{61}; **οὖρος**, not **ὅρος**, Samos, 216; and if Roehl 406 is Ionic, then HOPOΣ must be read **Ηοῦρος**. In Herodotos, **οὖρος**, **ὁμουρέειν**, **οὐρίζειν**, etc., Demokr. *Mor.* **οὖρος**. In Arrian, 2, **ὅρος**, **οὖρος** 40, Euseb. Mynd. 13, **οὖρον**. Solon, trim. 36_4, has the Attic form.

δουρ- is not found in Mss. of Hdt. in the oblique case forms, though Tyrt. $11_{20, 37}$, Archil. eleg. 3_5 have the **ου** form, which alone is genuine Ionic. Cf. **Δουρίης**, Adesp. 21 (Western Ionic) of the sixth century. The epic **δορ-**, Archil. eleg. $3_{1, 2}$.

κοῦρος, amply attested on Ionic inscriptions and by Greg. Corinth. *d. d. Ion.*, p. 387; cf. p. 489.

Ἐπίκουρο[ς] Styra, 19_{35}, Samos, 221_2.

Φούρη, Naxos, 23; but **Κόρηι**, Paros, 65 (late); **Κόρης**, Eryth. 206 B 22 (almost an Attic inscription).

Διοσκουρίδης, Halik. 240_{32}.

[1] **Οὔρειος**, **οὐρεσιβώτης** in the tragedians make for an Ionic **οὐρ-**. Solmsen, K. Z., XXIX, 358, goes so far as to hold that in **ὅρος** (Dor.) and **ὕρος**, **ω** and **ο** are ablaut vowels.

Digitized by Google

Δ]ιοσκούρο[ι]σι 257 (unc. loc.); but Διοσκόρων, Eryth. 206 A 7 (Attic).

Διοσκουρίδευς, Thasos (L.), 11 C 11.

Διοσκουρίδου, Thasos (L.) 20 B 3.

In the poets we find κουρ-, Tyrt. 10_6; 15_2, 16 (Doric !).

Διόσκουρος, Hipponax, 120, and so in Hdt., who has also κουρίδιος.

κόρος, Attic, Hdt. only IV, 33, 34. Aret. 18 has κούρησι; Archil. 120, in the iobacchics, uses κόρης. On κουρεύς, cf. K. Z., XXIX, 128.

122. Other Ionic forms with ου.

Οὐρανίῃ, Phanag. 164, 168; Οὐρανίη, on an old amphora, C. I. G. 8412. Wackernagel derives from ϝορz-, *rain*, with accent on the syllable after the radical syllable (K. Z., XXIX. 129). In that case we may connect ϝέρση and ϝουρέω. The older attempts at derivation assume ρϝ (ϝυϑn-).

οὐρή, *tail*, illustrates Wackernagel's accent theory, K. Z., XXIX, 127.

2. ουλ.

(α)ολϝ.

οὐλαί, Hdt. < ϝολϝο- ?

Hom. οὖλος, *entire*, < ὁλϝο- is not represented by the same form in later Ionic. The absence of any form except ὅλος shows that the parallelism between Hom. Ionic ου by compensatory lengthening = Doric ω = Attic ο is not complete. Attic, Doric, and Ionic here agree in having ὅλος.

Proper names in Πουλυ- have come to light in Megarian and Thessalian as well as Ionic. Hdt. has πολλός (cf. πολλάς, Abdera, 162, metrical); but that πουλύς may have been Ionic is probable from πουλύπους in Attic (Athenaios, VII, 316), which looks like a loan from πουλύς. Theog. 509 need not be Megarian, but is to be classed with such Ionisms as πουλύποδος, ε 432, Hym. Apoll. 77.

Πουλυδάμας, Samos, 153_7, Eretria, 16 B 5.

-χάρου, Eretria, *B. C. H.* II, 277.

Πουλύωνο[ς], Chios, 187.

Πουλυάναξ, Thasos (L.), 8 B 1.

Πούλυος, Thasos, 78 B 11.

Πο||λυρ.δης, Styra, 19_{286}.

There are no names in Πουλυ- in Hdt.

Cf. also in other dialects: —

Πουλυτίων in the Hermokopidai process (Thuk.).

Digitized by Google

Megara, Πουλύας, Πουλυχάρεος, Revue Arch. XXX$_{19}$; Πουλυδάμας, Le Bas, Explications, No. 346.

Πουλυδάμας, Thessal. 345$_{79-80}$.

There are no names in Πολλο-, but those in Πολυ- are abundant.

Πολυάρκης 19$_{287}$, and perhaps 19$_{406}$.

Πολύδωρος 19$_{288}$.

Π[ο]λυξειν[ί]δης 19$_{407}$.

Πολλυξίδης 19$_{286}$, framed from Πολύξενος.

Πολύθρους, Thasos, 75 B 11, Teos, 158$_{27}$.

Πολυάρητος, Abdera, 163$_{12}$, Maroneia, 196$_{15}$, Thasos, 72$_{3}$.

Πολυδάμας, Thasos, 76$_{8}$.

Πολυαίνετος, Thasos, 81 B 11, Thas. (L.) 3$_{7}$, 6 A 9, 15 C 10.

Πολύοκτος, Eretria, 16 B 37, 49; also Thessal. 345$_{76}$.

Πολύχαρμος, Smyrna, 153$_{11}$.

Πόλυος, Smyrna, 153$_{22}$.

Πολυπείθης, Erythrai, 206 A 28.

Πολύϊδος, Halik. 240$_{46}$.

Πολύφαντος, Thasos (L.), 6 C 9.

Πολυαλθέος, Thasos (L.), 10$_{11}$.

Πολύτιμος, Thasos (L.), 21$_{5}$.

Πολυ-, Thasos (L.), 16 A 17, B 3.

Πόλυ[β]ος, Volci, Roberts, 188 H.

Bechtel holds that the names in Πουλυ-, in whatever dialect found, are due to the influence of the epos. This, if true, does not render nugatory our contention that the Homeric verse does not create genuine forms in the dialects, since proper names have their own history. It is better to regard πουλυ- as a genuine prose form, from contamination of πολυ- and πουλ-, πουλ- originating in the oblique cases (πολ̯υ-ός).

πουλύς is but sparingly attested in the late Ionists. Lukian and Arrian follow Hdt., while the medical writers use now πουλυ-, now πολυ-. πουλύ occurs in the letters of Hippokrates (XVII, 16 in *c*); elsewhere πολύς and πολύ should probably be read (Lindemann, p. 12 ff.).

It is no contradiction of the laws of phonetic development that πουλ- and πολ- should be coexistent at one and the same time in a single dialect. As in Ionic, so too in Megarian (Baunack, *Stud.* I, 229) are both forms permissible. A πωλ- is, however, foreign to Ionic, despite πώλυπον, Sim. Amorg. 29. Perhaps Sim. of Keos is the Simonides referred to by Athenaios, VII, 318 F.

Digitized by Google

(β) ουλ from ολν.
οὖλος, *crisp*, < ϝολνο- ?
οὐλόμενος, Tyrt. 7_2, Theog. 156, 1062.
βούλομαι, probably from βολνο-, from βωλν- ? Forms with O :—
βΟληται, Oropos, 18_{31} ; ΚριτοβΟλης, Kyme, 2.
Θεοβούλου, Naxos, 28 and Βουλοθέμιος, Naxos, 28 with OY (late)

NOTE.—The ου of Οὔλυμπος appears to be due to the metre alone in Homer and Theog. 1136. In Herodotos 'Ολ- is to be written, a form attested by Xenoph. 2_3, Theog. 1347, Solon, tr. 36_2, Sim. Amorg. 7_{21}, Arch. tetr. 74_2, Hipponax, tr. 30 A; 'Ολυμπίω (dat.), Miletos, 101 (late), and 'Ολυμπιόδωρος, Smyrna, 153_{27} (before 350 B.C.).

123. Other cases of ου.

Editors of Hdt. reject οὐδῶν, *ways*, I, 123 (cf. *Od.* 17, 196), but accept οὐδόν, *threshold*, I, 90. So long as this ου is to be regarded as metrical merely, it cannot belong to common Ionic speech. Samos, $220_{30, 36}$, has ὀδοῦ (346/5 B.C.).

νοῦσος, Hdt. Mimn. 6, Solon, 24_{10}, Theog. 274, etc., is not from *νογκιος = *νονσσος, as Curtius held in his *Studien*, X, 328, but from σνοϝτιος, = Old Norse snauðr, *stripped*, *poor*, *bereft*, sneyðiligr, *destitute* (Germ. *schnöde*). νοῦσος occurs in late poetry, B. C. H., VIII, 502, No. XI, from Phrygia; *Am. Arch. Instit.* III, 341_3. Lukian adopts the form seven times in the *Syria dea*, Arrian has it chap. 15; Herakleitos, epist. V, VI; Pherekyd. and Hippokr. epist.; and so too in Aretaios. Hdt. always uses νοσέω, if Mss. authority means anything, and Hippokrates, Lukian, and Aretaios agree in adopting this form. The Mss. of these authors fluctuate constantly between νόσημα and νούσημα, to the former of which preference must be given. Sim. Amorg. iamb. 1_{12} has νόσοι, corrected by Ahrens and Renner (see especially the latter in Curtius' *Stud.* I, 178). The author of the *Vita Homeri* used the ο form alone.

Συρακούσιος appears to exist in Ionic side by side with Συρακόσιος. That the latter is not a fictitious form is evident from its occurrence in C. D. I. 1200, incorrectly supposed to be Arkadian, and in inscriptions from Agrigentum, Cauer,[2] $199_{9, 13}$, etc. -κουσα is from -κοντια, -κοσα from -κοτια, instead of -κατια, by influence of the former termination.

124. Ionic OY = AY of other dialects.

This is found in ἐντοῦθα, Oropos, 18_{17} (Hdt. ἐνθαῦτα, Sim. Amorg. 23, ἐνταῦθα). Cf. ἑοντῶν, Panionion, 144_4 (an inscription indifferently

Digitized by Google

copied). Cf. Attic Οὐλιᾶται, C. I. A., I, 231_7 = Αὐλιᾶται, C. I. A., I, 226_{13}. α seems to have become ο through influence of the following υ. This change is unique, recalling only indirectly ω for αυ. See § 19, 111.

125. ΗΥ.

In the dialect life of Greece wherever ηυ appears before a consonant it is not an original diphthong.[1] So Ionic γρηῦς, νηῦς with η from the oblique cases (νηϝ-ός γρηϝ-ός); so too in πρηύς, whence Πρηύλος, a Thasian name (and Πρεάνθης, Keos, 50, IV, 65), from root *prāi.* ηυ in the augment (*e.g.* ηὐξήσατε, Solon, 11_3) is not proethnic *ēu* or *āu.* In Attica ηυ as augment of ευ- verbs held its ground until the second half of the fourth century. Hipponax, 63_2, has κατηυλίσθην, but Hdt. often avoids ηὐ-.

126. ΩΥ.

Like ηυ, ΩΥ is not an original diphthong in the dialects. ωυ originates in Ionic chiefly by crasis, as in τωὐτό, ἐμεωυτοῦ, σεωυτοῦ, ἑωυτοῦ < ἔο + αὐτοῦ. All these forms are based on the genitive. ἐμαυτοῦ, σαυτοῦ, are from analogy to ἐμ(ε)αὐτόν, σ(ε)αὐτόν. Whether κοὐ (*e.g.* κΟΥκ, on a papyrus, cited Blass, *Aussprache,*[3] 43) is for κωὐ, as in Sappho's κωὐκ 1_{24}, κωὐδέν, Epicharmos, 19, may well be doubted. The same Ionic papyrus has ΚΕΝ, *i.e.* κ' + ἐν, and Sappho's δαῦτε by the side of δηῦτε shows the possibility of elision, κ'(αι) + οὐ. Nor would I agree to Blass' explanation of ἑουτῶν, Priene, 144 = C. I. G. 2908 (Mykale), from ἑωυτῶν. A form ἑωυτῶν is utterly unknown on Ionic inscriptions. Its α of ἑουτῶν became ο either through assimilation to υ as ε became ο in Kretan ψουδία, or it is due to the influence of οὗτος, etc.

To a limited extent outside of crasis, ωυ appears in Ionic. Hdt. θωῦμα, θωυμάζω, τρωῦμα, IV, 180, in one Ms.; Luk. *Astr.* 3, *Syr.* 7, 8, 10, 30, has θωῦμα, θωυμάζω 13, 32, 36, and the *Vita Homeri,* θωυ-. Arrian, *Ind.* θαῦμα 15, but θῶμα 40, as Euseb. § 3. The epistles of Hippokr. have generally the Attic form; τρωῦμα is found in the majority of the Mss. *Syr.* 20, while Arrian, *Ind.* 19 has τρῶμα. Lindemann (*de dialecto Ionica recentiore,* p. 30) holds that the ωυ of θωῦμα is due to the influence of ἑωυτοῦ, etc. A partial support for this suggestion is to be sought in the fact that Greg. Corinth. p. 419, by

[1] In a pre-dialectal period *ēu, ōu, āu,* having become *ĕu,* etc., before consonants, their history is the same as that of I.E., *ĕu,* etc.

Digitized by Google

quoting ὠὐτός, seems to regard ωυ and αυ as interchangeable. Aretaios, in fact, abounds in forms which indicate that the grammarians were ignorant of the true interrelation of ωυ and αυ. See § 74, 111.

NOTE. — Perhaps θωῦμα may be explained from θᾱϝέομαι; and was thus the incentive to the formation of a τρωῦμα.

127. VOWEL CONTACT.

I. Contact of like vowels.

II. Contact of unlike vowels.

III. Contact of vowels and diphthongs, diphthongs and diphthongs.

Under these heads will be treated actual contraction, poetical synezesis, diaeresis, and crasis.

Both medial combination of vowels and diphthongs and sentence *Sandhi* are thus included.

Under the head of a short or long vowel + η, ω, are included ηι, ωι. Examples of the crasis of ι and υ diphthongs are placed under the head of α, ε, ο + the vowel in question (*e.g.* αι + ε under O + E). In citing inscriptions I have generally selected only those of considerable antiquity.

I. CONTACT OF LIKE VOWELS.

128. A + A.

1. ᾰϝᾰ = ᾱ in ἄτη (except Archil. 73), ἀτηρός, Theog. 433, 634, Solon, 4_{36}, $13_{13, 68, 75}$.

2. ᾰσᾰ = ᾱ : κρέᾱ, Sim. Amorg. 24, and Hdt.; otherwise -ας stems have -εα in Hdt.

3. Hdt. τἆλλα, τἀγάλματα, etc. (Bredow, 201). τἆλλα we find in an almost Attic inscription, Teos, 158_{13}; τὰ ἄλλα, Eryth. 204_{18}; and τὰ ἀγάλματα, Miletos, 93.

Crasis of AI + α = Ionic ᾱ : κἀποθυμίη, Sim. Amorg. 7_{35}; κἀναρίθμιος, Arch. tetr. 63; κἀγαθός, Sol. tr. 36_{16}, Iasos, 105_{2}; κἄτιμος, Chios, 174 A 15; κἀπόλλωνι, Thas. 68 (κὠπολλώνι, Hipp. tr. 31 = καὶ ὁ Ἀπ-). Crasis with καὶ is almost always omitted in inscriptions: καὶ ἀγαθοί, Samos, 221_{5}; καὶ ἄρσεν, Thasos, 68; καὶ Ἀναξίλεως, Miletos, 93.

129. E + E.

1. εϝε.

(α) uncontracted; in Hdt. ῥέεθρον, as in Homer (εὐρεέτης, εὐρρεέος *sic*).

Digitized by Google

εε < ηϝε < ēve open in Hdt. (βασιλέες νέες),[1] closed in the inscriptions in the forms of the -ηυ- declension. See under **H + E.** ἠχέεντα, Archil. 74_8; τελέεντ', Tyrt. 4_2; χαιτέεσσ', Sim. Amorg. 7_{57};[2] Περίκλεες, Arch. 9_1, 16; Ἡράκλεες 119_2.

(β) contracted in Κλεῖτος, Th. (L.), 20 C 9, etc., in later inscriptions. κλειτός, in Theog. 777, Mimn. 17; Κλειτώνυμος, Thas. (L.), 8_9.

2. εσε was contracted to ει, *e.g.* in εἶχεν. In the ες declension the inscriptions have -εις, the prosaists -εες; in the future of verbs, Hdt. ὀλέεται. In Ionic on the expulsion of intervocalic *sigma* (and *yod*) no *metathesis quantitatis* took place.

3. ειε becomes ει in Ionic generally. Examples of -εε- in the imperative and imperfect act., present, imperf. mid. and inf. from prosaists alone are to be found under the section on the verb.[3] All these forms are probably figments of grammatical doctrine. In nouns, pronouns, and adj. εκε yields ει invariably: πόλεις, ἡμεῖς.

NOTE.—Whether the infinitive ending is ϝεν, σεν, or ιεν, the result of the combination of this ending with the final ε of the stem is always -ειν (*e.g.* ἐκχεῖν, Keos, 43_{22}, ἐπιτιθεῖν, etc.); also in θεῖναι, etc.

130. E + H (see Fritsch V. H. D. p. 31 ff.).

1. εϝη.

(a) contracted in νῆνι < νεήνι, Anakr. 14. Hippon. tr. 49 B 4, has κληδών, a form found also in Hdt. IX, 91, 101, without the *iota*.

On -κλῆς and -κλέης, see under *Declension*. Western Ionic has the open, Island, and Asiatic Ionic, the closed forms.

(b) uncontracted in δέηται, Olynth. 8_4, Νεήπολις, Neapolis, 4_1, parallel form to Νεο-.

εη < ηϝ(ι)η < ēviā in πλέη, Hdt. I, 178 (πλῇ, Diogenes of Apollonia, Hdn. π.μ.λ. 7, 8).

εη < ηϝη < āvā remains open in θέη, θέημα, Sim. Amorg. 7_{67}, θέησεσθαι (but θησάμενος, Abdera, 162).

εη < ηϝε in λεηλατέω < ληϝ(ο) + ἐλατέω, K. Z. XXVII, 269.

2. εση.

On ἔῃ, ἦ in παρεῖ, Oropos, 18_{26} and on ἔην, ἦν, see *sub* **MI** *Conjugation*.

[1] Cf. -ίες for ῆς in Attic Ἀλαιέες, etc.

[2] Fick, B. B. XI, 266, 271, writes εη < ηε in all these cases. This metathesis quantitatis is, however, not a necessary, only a possible, change in Ionic. Forms in ηε are usual, see § 131. Ἀλέεντος, Mimn. 9_5 may be correct.

[3] ἐκτέετο, ἐχρέετο, οἰκέεται, Πυθέεω, in Hdt. are forms due to grammatical theories, and do not represent any actual dialect.

Digitized by Google

3. ει̯η.

(a) In substantives.

In the nouns in -έης, -ῆς, we find that the poets use the contracted forms: Ἑρμῆς, Hipponax, 32, 55 B, Anakr. 111_3 (voc. Ἑρμῆ, Hipp. 1, 16, 21, 89). Ἑρμῆι Abdera, 162 (metr.), Lampsakos, 171; Ἀπελλῆς, Iasos, $104_{15,42}$ (and so probably Anakr. 72 B, where Bergk writes -έης; cf. Μεγιστῆς 41); Λεωνῆς, Keos, 44 A 5; Δημῆς, Thasos, 78 C 14, Thas. (L.) 13 A 10; Θαλῆς, Miletos, 93 (sixth century). Hdt. has also Θαλῆς, I, 74. With such authoritative testimony in favor of the contracted form, we cannot but conclude that Βορῆς is the genuine Ionic form, despite the fact that the Mss. of Herodotos prefer -έης, though in VII, 189 there are two occurrences where the Mss. with but one dissenting voice speak in favor of -ῆς. The same conclusion will hold good in the case of βορῆς, Ἀριστῆς, Πυθῆς.

γῆ is from γέα < *γῆα from γᾱια (but see Merzdorf, *Stud.* IX, 225, Wackernagel, *K. Z.* XXVII, 269). ἀδελφῆι, Roberts, 158 B (Amorgos-Arkesine), is not in itself an obstacle to the validity of the Herodotean ἀδελφεή, though we have ἀδελφή (*sic*), Mykonos, 92_{22} (Attic?), and Halik. 240 D 34, parallel to the masc. ἀδελφός. If we admit a by-form in -εη as Ionic, the open -εη cannot be said to be in harmony with the usual treatment of ε + η. When ι was retained in Hdt. (ἱρείη) but disappeared in a later period, contraction ensued (ἱερῆ, Pantikap. 123, Ephesos, 150).

γενεή is open in Solon, 27_{10}; ε + η = η in ῥοδῆς, Arch. 29_2; γαλῆς, Sim. Amorg. 7_{50}; Ἑρμῆ, Hipp. 1_2, 16, 21, 89, Ἑρμῆν 32, Ἑρμῆς 55 B, συκῆν 34, Μιμνῆ 49; Anakr. Μεγιστῆ 16_2, 74_3; κωλῆν, Miletos, 100_3, Xenoph. 5; συκέῃς, Anan. 5_2.

Avoidance of contraction will have to be accepted in a few proper names: Αἰνεητῶν, Ainea, 12 (550 B.C.), later, Αἰνητῶν (end of fourth century); Νεμέηι, Thasos, 69 (fifth century); Κρεήτη, Archil. 175 = Κρήτη (a *pun* on κρέας?); Hdt. Τεγέη, Θυρέη.

(b) In adjectives (masc. -εος; fem. -εη, -η).

The forms will be quoted under the Ā *Declension*. The inscriptions prove that when η follows ε, contraction ensues, when ο or α follows ε, the forms are kept open till the latest period of declining Ionism. In the poets -ῆ almost without exception (-αλέη and κυνέην κυνέηι, Tyrt. 11_{32}),[1] χρυσῆς, Mimn. 1, ἀργυρέῃ, Anakr. 33. πορφυρέῃ,

[1] Renner, in Curtius' *Studien*, I, 217, claims that the open forms alone are admissible. κερδαλέῃ occurs Archil. 89_5, ἀργαλέῃ, Anakr. 43_5, but Ἀγχαλέη, Hippon. 99.

Digitized by Google

Anakr. 14; πορφυρέῃ, Anakr. 2_8; πορφυρῆς, Sim. Amorg. 1_{16}. Cf. § 155. In Herodotos we find -ῇ generally, but not without exceptions; *e.g.* διπλέῃ, III, 42.

As regards the forms of -ΕΩ verbs, Merzdorf's "law" that after consonants εη remains open, but is contracted after vowels, has been accepted in many quarters; but incorrectly, as is clear from the fact that his contention is based upon a mere numerical count of Mss. For the establishing of the dialect of Herodotos, we cannot assume that a given form is genuine Ionic merely because a varying per cent of Hdt.'s Mss. speaks in favor of its adoption. The inscriptions proclaim that the Ionians in their decrees adopted the contraction without exception; and the poets unite with the inscriptions in their opposition to the Merzdorfian law. All the MI verbs too contract εη. On ἐθεῆτο in Hippokr. see under *Conjugation.*

131. H + E.

1. ηϝε.

From ēve, remains uncontracted in a few forms of the -ηυ- declension, as in φονῆες, Archil. 59. See under E + E.

āve in ἠέλιος (σᾱϝελιος): the elegiac poets adopt this form alone (Tyrt. 11_6, Mimn. 1_8, 2_8, 12_1, 14_{11}, Solon, 13_{23}, 14, Theog. 168, 1183, etc.). The iambographers contract: ἥλιος, Archil. tetr. 74_4, Hipp. tr. 15_5, Sim. Amorg. 1_{19}, and in Anak. 27; and upon an inscription Arkesine, 33, Ζεὺς Ηήλ[ιο]ς (fifth century), Herodotos, II, 92, ἥλιος (Bredow, 45), as Arrian, 11; Lukian using ἠέλιος, *Astr.* 3, 5, etc., *d. S.* 29, 34. Both forms form a part of the poet's material in Aiolic (Sappho, 69, 79).

ηε also in adjectival forms (nom. -ήεις), Kall. 1_6, τιμῆεν; Mimn. 5_5, τιμήεσσα; 12_7, τιμήεντος; Phok. 3_3, χαιτηέσσης. On Fick's εη, Archil. 74_8, Sim. Amorg. 7_{57}, Mimn. 9_5 see § 129. ηε in these forms often in Hdt., ηε in the poets and in prose writers is found only when ϝ followed η. Forms with ηε seem to be obsolescent in the seventh century.

ἦρι < āuser-, in ἠριγένεια, Mimn. 12_{10}, as in Homer. ἠέριος, etc., must be kept distinct from ἠήρ, Hdt. ἠέρα. Notice also ἔαρι = ἦρι, Ananiós, 5_1.

NOTE. — On Fick's Χαραΐληε, Archil. 79, see § 30.

2. ηϝε.

[χ]ρῆσθ[αι], Keos, 43_{12}, is not necessarily for χρηϝεσθαι, since it may be formed directly from χρη + σθαι (Johansson, *D. V. C.* p. 155).

Digitized by Google

Cf. § 36, 139, 155. ἔχρη in Tyrt. stands for ἔχρηε or for *ἐχρέη, if we assume that ηε in Ionic becomes εη. ἐδίψη, Hippokr. III, 36, 42, διψῆν, Hdt. II, 24, *i.e.* -η + -ϝεν or -σεν.

4. *Crasis* and *aphaeresis:*

With ἡ 'παρή, Teos, 156 B 36 (τἠπαρῆι, B 34, Chios *B. P. W.* 1889, p. 1195, as τἠτέρηι, Arch. 93₂,[1]) μὴ 'λάσσονες, Chios, 174 B 24, ἢ 'ς, Chios, 174 A 2, compare ἀρετή 'στιν, Theog. 147 and Phokyl. 17, oldest example of aphaeresis in the case of εἰμί, ἢ 'κ, Theog. 577 (in *A*), δὴ 'πίκουρος, Arch. tetr. 24, and perhaps Μιμνῆ 'κατομήχανε, Hippon. 49, ὀδύνη 'πιαλεῖ 21 B.

132. H + H.

Is contracted almost universally. On ἠήρ in Hippokrates (ἀϝήρ), see § 38. Ionic of the post-Homeric period does not possess such subjunctives as στήῃ, φανήῃ, σαπήῃ. On ἐθηῆτο, v. l. Hdt. I, 10, etc., see under *Conjugation*. ηε held ground longer than ηη.

133. O + O.

So far back as we can follow the history of Ionic, ο + ο became ου. In view of this fact the position assumed by many scholars that in Ionic ο + ο became ω, which afterwards became ου, is without foundation. The Doric dialects, which at different stages of their existence had ω and ου, offer but a specious parallel to an Ionic ου < ω. οσο in Homer never becomes ω as εσε never = η.

1. οϝο.

In a few nouns and adjectives of the O declension οο is apparently kept open to a limited extent: Hdt. νόος, εὔνοος, πλόος, διπλόος (but διπλῆ, Stein, *Praef.* LIII), σόον, βοός but χοῦς, etc. Love of the old-fashioned orthography dictated νόος in the Mss. Sim. Amorg. I, 3, where νοῦς, or νόος, must be read.[2] νόον in the same poet (7₁) must be an archaism, if the authority of the inscriptions is invoked. π[ρ]όχουν occurs upon a vase from Naukratis, Roberts, 132 *bis*. Perhaps contraction resulted during the seventh century, since Archil. 89 epod. and Mimn. 5₈ have νόον. Homer preserves νόος, but the beginnings of the later forms appear Ω 354, κ 240 (Menrad, p. 46). Later inscriptions have 'Αστύνους, Eryth. 206 C 9; Καλλίνους,

[1] ΤΕΤΕΡΕΙ = τἠτέρηι, Rob. 167, of uncertain dialect. Bechtel suggests Asiatic-Ionic. See Roberts, I, p. 374, Cauer,[2] 557, and § 6, note.

[2] νοῦς, Theog. 1185; νοῦν, Theog. 350, 898, Sol. 27₁₃, βοῦν 41.

Digitized by Google

Thas. (L.) 7_7; ἔκπλουν, ἔσπλουν, Eryth. 202_7; Πολύθρους, Thasos, 75 B 11 (Πολύθρου, Teos, 158_{27}).

The pseudo-Ionists have πλόος generally in the uncontracted form, though the compounds more frequently avoid the open forms. νόος, ῥόος, πνόος, -χροος, ἀθρόος, generally are found in the resolved forms. διπλόος prefers the closed forms.

In composition: Ἀθηναίῃ Πολιούχ[ωι, Eryth. 200 (epigr.), and so Roberts, p. 64, and Hdt. I, 160; Πολιούχου, Paros, 64_{16}; Τιμοῦχοι, Teos, 158_{26} (τῖμος in Aischylos); Ἀριστοῦχον, Ross, 148.

2. οι̯ο.

Σαπφόος, Λητόος, called Ionic by Herodian II, 238_{15}, 755_{21}, are supported by no such formation in the existing monuments of the dialect. Hdt. has Λητοῦς, Λητοῦν, etc., and φλοῦν. On the retention of -οιο < ο(σ)ι̯ο, see under O declension.

In verbs in -οω, ου, and never ευ, arises from ο + ο. The examples of ευ collected by Merzdorf, Curtius' *Studien*, VIII, 215, show the confusion as to the character of the Herodotean dialect in the minds of the diasceuasts.

134. O + Ω.

1. οϝω.

χῶν, Keos, 43_9, fifth century; cf. π[ρ]όχουν, Naukratis, 139 A. Hdt. keeps σόων open, so νόῳ, συμπλόων.

2. οσω.

Always contracted, *e.g.* in gen. plural, O declension.

3. οι̯ω.

Contracts in verbal forms (δικαιῶ). ζῶμεν, Sim. Amorg. 3_2, from ζόωμεν < ζώομεν (so the Mss. 1_4), and ῥιγῶ, Hipponax, 16_2, 17, from ῥιγόω < ῥιγώω; λαγώς, Hipponax, 36 < -οως, from -ωους (Hdt. uses λαγός), if we extend the limits of *metathesis quantitatis* beyond those ordinarily set up for Ionic.

135. Ω + O.

1. ωϝο.

ἥρωος, Hdt.; ζωός, Tyrt. 10_{30}, with ω preserved before a short vowel by the interposition of ϝ. ζοοῦ is the correction of Porson for the traditional reading ζωοῦ, Archil. 63. Σῶος, Styra, $19_{23, 309}$.

2. ωι̯ο.

ἔζωον, Hdt. IV, 112, ζωόντων, I, 86, but ζῶντα, *ibid.* ζῶσα, IV, 205. The latter appear to be regular, yet the uncontracted participial forms may be defended. See B. B. XV, 170, 175, and M. U. I, 8.

Digitized by Google

136. Ω + Ω.

ωϊω.

ωω preserved in ζώω, Hdt. ζώων, Kallinos, 1_{19}. Anan. 5_5 λαγῶν is either from Hom. λαγωός or Hdt. λαγός.

137. I + I.

1. ιϝι.

The Ionic dialect permits, but does not require, contraction: Διί, Paros 65, a late inscription, Mylasa 248 C 6 (fourth century), both examples probably Attic; Δί, Eretria 14 (fifth century), Samos (?) in Roberts 157, Asiatic-Ionic, Bechtel No. 260. Hdt. has Διί. I do not find either form in the poets.

2. On ῑ in the dat. sing. of *iota* stems, see under *Declension*. In the optative of roots ending in *iota*, contraction of ι + ι is pan-Hellenic.

138. Note. — Before passing to the concurrence of unlike vowels, we may here treat of υ + ι, strictly not a diphthong, but a phonetic combination, the υ of which was probably *ü*. On the treatment of the υι of υἱός, see § 98. In the forms from which ι is absent, Cauer held (Curtius' *Studien*, VIII, 275) that υ and ι had been fused as in δύη, υ 286. ἰσχύι, νηδύι, are edited by Herodotean scholars as -εῖ in the dat. of -ες- stems.

II. Contact of Unlike Vowels (*horizontal and vertical vowels*).

139. A + E.

1. ἄϝε.

(a) Uncontracted in ἀέκων, Theog. 371, 467, 471, 1379, ἀεκούσιος, Theog. 1343, both forms in Hdt. and in Lukian. Hipp. ΠΤΚ 10 has ἀέκων, Aretaios, 58, ἀεκουσίου. ἀέκων may be read in every case in Homer. In Attic the form is open in the law of Drakon (C. I. A. I, 61_{34}), but contracted before the middle of the fifth century in ἀκούσι[α], C. I. A. I, B, 1.

ἄεθλον, Archil. ep. 104, Tyrt. 12_{13}, Mimn. 11_3; πενταεθλεύω, Xenoph. 2_2; Hdt. ἄεθλον, ἀεθλοφόροι, πεντάεθλον, etc. Contracted ἆθλα, Theog. 971, 994, 1014, Hippokr. ΠΑ 6; πενταθλεῖν, Xenoph. 2_{16}; ἄθλοις, Roberts 174, Kyme; ἄελπτος, Arch. tetr. 74, Solon tetr. 35; ἀελπτίη, Arch. tetr. 54_3; ἑξηκονταέτης, Mimn. 6_2; ὀγδωκονταέτης, Sol. 20_4; πενταέτης, Hdt. cf. Attic πενταέτης and πεντέτης; ἑκάεργος, Tyrt. 3_2, Solon 13_{53}; ἀεργός, Theog. 1177, but ἀργός, Theog. 584, Hipp. tr. 28, Hdt. III, 78; ἀΐξω, Sim. Amorg. 7_{85}, Sol. 27_5, Theog. 1031, 1276. Hippokr. αὔξω, αὐξάνω, Mimn. 2_2, Theog. 362, αὔξεται, Sol. 11_3, ηὔξατε, are from ἀϝ(ε)ξ-.

Digitized by Google

αἰέλουρος, not ἀελ-, is the Herodotean form.

(β) Contracted ἀρθείς, preferred by Mss. of Hdt. to ἀερθείς (Bredow 193, Merzdorf, Curtius' *Stud.* VIII, 186). Anakreon, 19, ἀρθείς. See on ἀείρω, *sub* A + EI, § 171.

NOTE 1. — Contraction of ἀϝε, both in α privative and other forms seems to have been possible at least as early as the sixth century. In the ordinary speech of the people many forms were doubtless contracted which were kept open by the artifices of literary expression.

NOTE 2. — In the inf. active α + ϝεν (or -σεν), *e.g.* ἐσορᾶν; see § 171. On τεθνάναι, Amphip. 10_9, and Mimn. 2_{10}, as the Mss. read, or τεθνᾶναι < τεθνα + εναι (cf. γεγον-έναι), see under *Conjugation.*

2. ᾰι̯ε.

Always contracted in verbal forms: ὥρα, ὁρᾶσθαι, διεπειρᾶτο, ἐφοίτα, Hdt. χρᾶσθαι from χρᾰ + εσθαι, Keos 42_{12}, χ]ρῆσθ[αι] from χρη + εσθαι, or from *χρηίομαι (Merzdorf, *l.l.* p. 210, G. Meyer, *Gramm.* § 51, Johansson, *D. V. C.* p. 155). See § 36, 131, 155.

Crasis of α + ε in τἀν, Chios 174 C $19 =$ τἀγ 174 C 22; τἀμά, Theog. 346, Archil. tr. 50, but often kept apart: τὰ ἐμά, Hdt. VIII, 101, but θάτερα, IV, 157, despite Bredow's protests (p. 201). αι + ε in κἀσθλοῖσιν, Theog. 355; κἀκφέρῃ, Hippon. 29; κἀγώ, Amorg. Rob. 160 A; κἀμοί, κἀκεῖνον, Hdt.; κἀπιτετρῖφθαι, Sol. 33_7; κἀγδικασάντων, Chios 174 B 22; κἀπίελπτα, Archil. 74_5.

140. A + H.

αι̯η.

In verbal forms: τιμᾷ, τιμᾶτε (Doric η).

αϝη contracts in Δανᾶ, Hekat. 358 M.; on the other hand in Δαναίη, Miletos 99, a glide *iota* has been generated between α and η, as in Παμφαίης from Παμφάης; cf. Δανάη Ξ 319. Νικᾶ, Thasos, 72_8 < Νικάη; cf. ἱερῆ < ἱερείη. μνᾶς, Hippon. 20 < μνᾰῆς, Attic μνᾶς from μνᾰᾶς. *Crasis* of καὶ + ἤν = κἄν, Ephesos $145_{3,4}$, Chios 174 C 5 (in both inscriptions ἤν, not ἐάν or ἄν); Hippokr. κῆν, ΠΚ 111, 283, 491, 599, ΠΑ 15, etc.; κἠλειφόμην, Sim. Amorg. 16; χἠμέρη, Theog. 160, κἠμέρης, Anan. 5_{10}. Where crasis might take place in the inscriptions it is omitted: καὶ Ἡγήσανδρος, Miletos 93; καὶ Ἡρακλείοισιν, Teos 156 B 33; καὶ ἠθμόν, Prokon. 103_8.

141. A + I.

1. ᾰϝι

= αῖ and αι. πάϊς occurs in but one passage in older Ionic poetry (Archil. tetr. 70, πάϊ). Renner (Curtius' *Stud.* I, 189) seeks to find

Digitized by Google

an excuse for the *se judice* irregularity of the Archilochian πάϊ by assuming a "poetic diaeresis." No such license can be admitted; and these forms find their explanation, in comparison with Hipponax', παῖδα 1, παῖδας 14, and ᾱι in Solon, in the fact that the dissyllabic αϊ in nominative and vocative, and the monosyllabic αι in oblique cases are an inheritance from Homeric times. πάϊς is, however, not an archaism whose observance was enforced. Sim. Amorg. 1_1 has παῖ, Hipponax, 38, παῖς. Anakreon has παῖ, 1_2, 4_1, 62, 63_1; πάϊς, 21_{13}; παῖς, 24_2. Oblique forms, παῖδα, Hipp. 1, παιδί, Anakr. 17_3 (αϊ possible); παῖδες, Anakr. 45; παίδων, Mimn. 2_{13} (αϊ possible); παισίν, Mimn. 1_9, 3_2; παῖδας, Hipp. 14_1; Hdt. παῖς (Bredow, 174); κλαίων, Archil. 13, is possible, κλαίω, 20, necessary; πυρκαϊῆς, Anakr. 100_2 (ᾱι possible); ἀΐω, Xenoph. 6_5; ἀΐδηλος, Tyrt. 11_7 (cf. *v.l.* E 757, Δ 897), ἀϊστώσει, ἠΐστωσε, Hdt. III, 69, 127. See § 142 on Ἀΐδης. ἄϊδρις, Theog. 683; ἀϊδρίη, Solon 9_4; ἀϊδρηΐη, Hdt.; αἰκιζοίμεθα, Sim. Amorg. 1_{24}, from ἀϝικ- rather than ἀϝεικ-. So too in the case of αἰκέλιος, Theog. 1344.

In suffixes: δᾰΐζω, Tyrt. 11_{17}; ἀγλᾰΐζομαι, Sim. Amorg. 7_{70}; Σᾰΐων, Arch. el. 6; -αϊκος in Hdt.

ᾱϝι.

142. Ᾱ + I.

Πολυπαΐδης, Theog. 25, 57, 61, 541, from πᾱ, § 38, or due to the ictus and = παυ; Ἀριστολαΐδης, Hdt. I, 59.

Ἀΐδης, Sim. Amorg. 1_{14}, 7_{117}, with ᾱ as in the tragic poets. ᾰ in Ἀΐδης, Tyrt. 12_{28}, Mimn. 2_{14}, Theog. 427, 703, 802, 906, 1014, 1124, Solon 24_8, Anakr. 43_5; with no instance of a necessary ᾱι. Ἀΐδης probably does not revert to an original Ἀϝίδης, but to *Αἰϝίδης, which became either ᾱϊδ- or ᾰϊδ- (cf. ἀεί < ἀιϝεί). Hdt. II, 122, has καταβῆναι ἐς τὸν οἱ Ἕλληνες Ἀΐδην νομίζουσι εἶναι. See Wackernagel, K. Z. XXVII, 276, and above, § 30.

ἀΐδιον, Iasos, 104_6, may be a later form, built out of ἀεί. The length of the α in ἀΐδιος is attested but rarely, *e.g.* Hymn. 29_3, where it may be due to the ictus.

Ἀχαΐη, Sim. Amorg. 23_1, where αϊη might be expected. Since the reduction of αι to αϊ in Attic ensued as early as the fifth century (Φωκαΐδε[ς], C. I. A. I, 199_7), the traditional reading may be correct. See § 77, on α from antevocalic αι.

143. Ᾱ + H.

Original ᾱ + η did not remain in Ionic; see Η + Η.

Digitized by Google

144. A + O.

1. ἄϝο.

σαόφρων, Phok. 9, as in Homer: σωφρονεῖν, Sim. Amorg. 7_{108}, σώφρων, Theog. 756, σωφρονέστατον, Hippon. 45_{2}, need not contain a contraction. These forms are placed here tentatively, as it has not been shown that ϝ intervened between α and ο in σάος. Certainly Roehl's reading, 532, σαϝοῖ, is too much a matter of dubitation to be admitted in proof. Perhaps σάος stands for *σασος. See Ruehl in *Philol. Anzeiger*, 1886, 14, note 8, and § 161.

θυρωρός < θυρᾰ + ϝορ- (Fick: θυρεωρός < θυρη-ϝορός); cf. τιμωρός < τιμᾰ-.

ἀγλαός:

(1) Not contracted: ἀγλαόν, Kall. I, 6, elegy; Ἀγλαοκύδης, Thasos (Louv.) 20 A 8 (about 175 B.C.); Ἀγλα(ό)νικος, Styra 19_{433} (fifth century). The preponderance of names in Ἀγλω- has made Bechtel question whether we should not read Ἀγλώνικος. Ἀγλαοκύδης shows that Bechtel's statement (that Ἀγλω- is the invariable rule in Ionic inscriptions) is not accurate. It must, however, be confessed that this form of the name is, if Ionic, an obsolete form for its period. Ἀγλα[ο]φῶν, Kyzikos C. I. G. 1780 is late.

(2) Contracted: Ἀγλώχαρος, Amorgos 227 (sixth century); Ἀ(γ)λωθέστης, Amorgos 37 (unc. date); Ἀγλώνικος, Keos 50 II, 11 (fourth century); Ἀγ]λωφῶντος, Thasos 78 A 2 (beginning of third century); Ἀ[γ]λωφῶντος, Thasos (Louv.) 6 B 14 (third century); Ἀγλωγένης, Delos 55 I 7 (282 B.C.); cf. also Ἀγλῶν, Thasos (Louv.) 2_{14}.

We find in other dialects: Ἀγλωφάνης, Thera, C. I. G. 2460; Ἄγλαος, Boiot. 413_{35}; Ἀγλαοφαΐδαο, Boiot. 478.

φάος, Archil. tetr. 74_{3}, Sim. Amorg. 1_{19}, Theog. 569, 1143; on the oblique cases of names in -φῶν, see Spitzer, *Lautl.* p. 41, Johansson, *D. V. C.* p. 16.

2. ἄσο.

Archil. 116, Mimn. 2_{6}, γήραος, also in Hdt. III, 14, in the phrase ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῷ, with the unusual form on account of the stereotyped nature of the expression. Hdt. generally has -εος in -ας nouns. -ασο, or more strictly, -ασϝο, in the second pers. sing. of imperfect and aorist middle: Archil. ep. 94, ἐφράσω 101, ἐδέξω, where Hdt. has ἐξεργάσαο, I, 45, and Xenoph. 5, ἤραο.

3. ἄιο.

On the relation of -ᾰω to -ᾱω (-ηω) verbs in ὥρεον = ὥραον, etc., see Johansson, *D. V. C.* p. 151, etc. αιο becomes ω in the

Digitized by Google

Ionic verb despite fluctuations in Mss. of Hdt. See under *Conjugation.*

On αο, written for -αυ, see under AY, § 110.

Varia. Ὠσπραόννωι, Halik. 240_{43}, Μάοψος, Roberts I, 193 D, are of uncertain derivation.

145. A + Ω.

1. ἄϝω.

παρεστώς, Tyrt. 12_{19}, and so Attic ἑστώς, probably not from Hdt. ἑστεώς, but from -αϝώς, as πυλωρός < πυλἄωρός. Also in proper names in -φῶν, § 106, and in Ἀγλῶν, Th. (L.) 2_{14}, § 144.

2. ἄιω.

For the treatment of -ἄω verbs, see under *Conjugation.* The contracted forms alone seem genuine Ionic.

Crasis of αι + ω in χὠς, Sim. Amorg. 24 (but καὶ ὡς, Halik. 238_{44}); κὠπόλλων, Hippon. tr. 31, according to Bergk's reading, which is open to grave doubts (see Renner, p. 199).

146. Â + Ω.

1. ᾱϝω.

Ποσειδάων, Theog. 692; -άωνος in Arch. eleg. 10, by conjecture, the Mss. having ω. Is -ήωνος correct? See § 11. If Attic Ποσειδῶν is from -έων, this instance deserves note as being a rare case of contraction of vowels originally separated by ϝ (ἕως, βασιλέως). Attic πρών, παιών (Παιῶνος, Solon 13_{57}), Ἴωνες, arose directly from -ᾱων, -ᾱον-, not through -εων (Bechtel, B. B. X, 283).

On the treatment of pre-Hellenic ᾱιο, see under E + O and E + Ω.

147. E + A.

NOTE. — ε before a vowel does not become ι in Ionic.

1. εϝᾰ.

Remains open in adj. in feminines of -υς (δασέαν, Miletos 100_{2}, etc.), in Κλεάριος, Thasos (L.) 4_{13}; Κλέανδρος, Styra 19_{220}; Λεάνακτος, Thasos (L.) 3 B 7; Λεάδης, Styra 19_{242}; Πρεάνθης, Keos, 50, IV, 65. Cf. πρηύς and the Thasiote Πρηύλος; ἐᾶσεις, Anakr. 56, ἔᾶσον 57.

βασιλέᾱ = Attic βασιλέᾱ (βασιλῆ, Teos. Ditt. *Syll.* 165_{18}, about 261 B.C.); νέᾱ = Attic ναῦν, βασιλέᾱς = Attic βασιλέᾱς (Curt. *Stud.* IX, 213). Εὐρυμεδοντιάδεα, Hipp. 85 (patronymic in -αδεύς, as Μαιαδεῦ, Hipp. 16_{1}), from εα (or εᾱ?).

ἐγχέας, Xenoph. 4_{2}; Anakr. 63_{3}, with synizesis. No instance of actual contraction occurs. φρέατος, Hdt. VI, 119.

Digitized by Google

2. εσᾰ.

Hdt. ἔαρος, ἔαρι, and *Vita Homeri*, 34; ἔαρι, Anan. tetr. 5_1; ἔαρος, Mimn. 2_2; ἦρος, Theogn. 777; ἠρινός, Solon 13_{19}; ἦρος, Hippokr. E I, 164, 181, E III, 213, 215, 216, 220; ἦρι, ΠΑ, 5. ἔαρος, E I, 192, though ἦρος immediately before, 160, 164, E III, 213, 221, etc. In old Attic inscriptions ἔαρ (Klein, *Vasen*, 133).. See § 90.

In ες declension: ἔτεα, Olynthos, 8 A 5; τέλεα, 8 B 6, 8; Στρατοκλέα, Orop. 10_2; ἀφανέα, Chios 174 A 12; ἀφανέας, Teos 156 B 38, and the other forms quoted under *Declension*. θύη, Keos 43_{17} (ὁλοσχερ[έα] on the same inscr., end of V C.). Both forms as attested by inscriptions find their parallels in lyric poetry: Solon, ἔτη 27_4, ἤθη 36_{12}, κράτη 36_{13}; Arch. 12 μέλεα; Sim. Amorg. 3_2 ἔτεα, δήνεα 7_{78}; Mimn. 1_4 ἄνθεα; Anakr. 8_2 ἔτεα, 9_3 στήθεα; Sim. Amorg. 7_{102} δυσμενέα; Mimn. 6_2 ἐξηκανταέτη; Anakr. 36 αἰνοπαθῆ, 41_2 μελιηδέα, 51_1 νεοθηλέα; Solon, 19_4 ἀσκηθῆ, 13_{62} ὑγιῆ; Theog. 1180 ἀσεβῆ. The open forms are in a minority: Archil. 9_1 κήδεα, Mimn. 14_8 βέλεα, Anakr. 94_2 νείκεα, Xenoph. 3_3 φάρε', Solon κέρδεα 13_{74}, Kallin. 4 Τρήρεας, Xenoph. 3_1 ἀνωφελέας. For a full list of forms, see under *Declension*.

3. ειᾰ.

Abstract nouns in εα from εια do not contract: ἐξώλεα, πανώλεα, Bechtel 263.

ὀστέα, Arrian 30, Aret. 42, 88, Hippokr. 188, 237; ὀστᾶ, Arrian 29; ὄστρεα, Arrian 21, 29, 39; κενεά, Luk. *vit. auct.* 13. ὑπέατι, Hdt. IV, 70.

ἡμέας, Archil. eleg. 9_7, σφέας, tr. 27_2, Hdt. ἡμέᾰς as γλυκέᾰς.

NOTE 1.—On κατέαται and ὁρμέατο < ηα, see under *Conjugation*. εἴρηται, Oropos 18_{17}, compared with ἐκκεκωφέαται, Anakr. 81_2, κεκινέαται, Hipponax 62_2, πεπλέαται, Sim. Amorg. 31 A, seems to represent a difference in writing merely. Whether or not the passage from original ηα to η was made in Ionic through εᾱ or εᾰ in the verbal forms is not as yet clear, though analogy would seem to incline in favor of εᾱ. Here no sound has been lost between ε and α < η + α.

ἤν ἐάν, see Bredow 38, Merzdorf, Curtius' *Studien* VIII, 143, and under *Conjunctions*, etc. In Theog. 682, we find ἄν where Schneidewin preferred ἤν. ἐπήν, Mimn. 3, Keos 43_{17}; Hdt. ἐπεάν (Greg. Corinth. p. 465), but ἤν.

4. Elision is frequently avoided in the inscriptions: με ἀνέθηκε, Naukr. 139 B.

148. E + Â.

On πεπλέᾱται < πεπλήᾰται, etc., see above *sub* E + A, note 1.

Digitized by Google

εᾱͅ.

In the inflection of nouns in εη the accus. plural remains open: κυνέας, μνέας, αἰγέας, etc.

ἀργυρέᾱ, Wood, *Disc. at Ephesus*, App. 6, No. 1, with Attic ᾱ, but with the absence of contraction in adjectives of material, which is the rule in Ionic till the imperial period.

εᾱͅ, from εᾳνς, also in δωρεάς, Ephesos 147_{15}; δωρεά appears to be later than δωρεία in Attic. ἐϝᾱ in ἔᾱ, Archil. 51, cf. ἧσεν· εἴασεν, Hesychios.

NOTE. — In proper names in -ᾱς it has been commonly held that -ᾱς is from -εας. Bechtel on No. 76 (Νοσσικᾶς) remarks with appropriateness that this is impossible, since Attic names in -εας could not be contracted to -ᾶς. On Attic Ἀλκᾶς from Ἀλκᾰμένης, Μολπᾶς 163_{10}, Abdera, from Μολπᾰγόρης, Abdera 163_{8}, and the name of a son of Aristagores in Miletos, Hdt. V, 30, and on Μικᾶς, Thasos (Louv.), 14_{7}, see § 34. εᾶς occurs in two names, Ἡγέᾶς, Keos 44 B 4; Ἐλπέᾶς, 44 B 16.

149. H + A.

η before the ᾰ of substantival and verbal inflections is regularly shortened to ε. It is a matter of indifference whether this η = I.E. ē or I.A. ā: νέᾰ νέᾰς, βασιλέᾰ βασιλέᾰς, κατέᾰται ὁρμέᾰτο. Traces of this shortening are sporadic in Homer: Τυδέᾰ Z 222, Καινέᾰ A 264, ἔαται ἕατο. πόλῆας, Abdera 162 (fifth century), η having the quantity of ω in ἡρῶος, ζ 303. In Homer, πόλῆας, ρ 486. ηας in Ἡσιονῆας, Kall. 5; βασιλῆας, Tyrt. 4_{3}. η is retained before α only when ϝ intervened (except Hom. πόληες). In Ionic these ηας forms are obsolescent even at a very early period.

By *crasis*, ἐπειδάν, Hdt. VIII, 144; by *synezesis*, μὴ ἀποπέμψῃς, Hippon. 43.

150. E + I.

1. εϝι.

εῖ in the dative-locative singular of -υ- stems, see under *Declension*.

2. εσι

Becomes ει in the dat.-loc. sing. of -ες- stems: Archil. 113 ἐναγεῖ, Sim. Amorg. 1_{13} Ἄρει (Ἄρῃ?), Hipponax 11 ἀγεῖ; ξίφει Tyrt. 11_{30}, κράτει Solon tr. 36_{13} (or κράτῃ), Theognis γένει 928, δυσμενεῖ 1219. -εῖ in Hdt. does not represent the stage to which Ionic had advanced in the fifth century. See under *Declension*.

3. In suffixes -ιτης, -ινος, etc. In Hdt. Ἀταρνεῖτεω, Βορυσθενεῖτης, ὀστεῖνος, ἰτέϊνος, κρανεῖνος.

Digitized by Google

151. E + Î.

εῖ by *metathesis quantitatis* has been assumed by Fick, *B. B.* XI, 267, Bechtel, *Ion. Insch.* p. 14, in Θρεΐκιος, Hipponax 42, *εῖ* standing midway between *ηι* (Θρῆϊξ Archil. 32, Θρηϊκίης Anakr. 96, Θρηϊκίῳ, Sim. Keos, 120), and *ēι*. Fick suggests that Anakr. Θρηικίην 49, Θρηικίη 75, should be read Θρεῖ-. As held above, § 105, this assumption seems to be based on slight foundations. On Θρεϊκίων, see Osthoff, *M. U.* IV, 209.

152. H + I.

ηϊ is very common in Ionic, both from *ηι* = I.E. *ēi* and I.E. *āi*.[1]

1. *ηϝι* < *ēvi*.

-ηΐδης not frequent: Σελληΐδης Archil. ep. 104$_2$, Βοιβηΐς, Νηρηΐς, Hdt. Σκηβηΐδης, C. I. G. 3064$_{28}$. Greg. Corinth. p. 379, quotes as Ionic Πηληΐδης, but by *Ionic* he doubtless means Homeric. With the exception of the instances quoted, *-ηιδης* has become *-ειδης* everywhere in Ionic. See under HI, § 104. With Νηρηΐδων, Νηρηΐσι in Hdt., cf. Νηιρείδων, Eryth. 206 B 27. ΕὐθυνΕΙδης Styra 19$_{194}$, ΝικοΛΕΙδης 19$_{272}$, ΠεριλΕΙδη(ς) 19$_{283}$, are transcribed with *ει* on account of the extreme rarity of *-ηΐδης*, despite the fact that *ηϝι* < *ēvi* generally = *ηι* in Ionic. By the fifth century *ῆι* in closed syllables could become *ει*.

-ηιον, *-ηιη*, in suffixes from stems in *-ηυ-* and from *-η-* stems, *e.g.* βασιλήϊος Theog. 1191, Hdt.; βασιληΐη, θεραπηΐη, στρατηΐη Hdt.; Νηλήϊος Mimn. 9; δουλήϊος Hdt.; δουληΐη Anakr. 114; οἰκήϊος (*-ηυ* stem). By analogy *-ηιος* is transferred to other stems. For these and those in *-ειο*, *-εια*, where *ηιο*, *-ηιη*, are to be expected, see above, § 101.

NOTE. — Either Κεῖος, or Κήϊος, is Ionic from Κέος. Hdt. VIII, 1, 46, Κεῖοι, IV 35, V 102, Κήϊοι; Sim. Keos, 129, Κει-; Bacchyl 48, Κηϊ-; Timokreon 10, Κήϊα, and Κείων Ἰουλιῆται, C. I. A. II, 17 B 22. See Wackernagel, K. Z. XXVII, 265, who regards Κεῖος as certainly Ionic whatever may be said of Κήϊος (*Κηϝιος, cf. Ionic λεῖος, from ληϝιο). βασιλεῖ is due to the influence of βασιλέος, etc. βασιλήϊος, etc., amply prove that I.E. *ēvi* is represented in Ionic by *ηϊ*. On Πριηνῆι, on a Samian inscription, No. 212, see under *Declension*.

[1] It is not easy to determine chronologically how long *-ηϊος* was regarded by the Ionists as a trisyllable. The cases of *η* in Ionic poetry though rare, as in Homer, show that *ηι* was not far removed from a diphthong. On the accent of βασιλήιος, see Fritsch, *V. H. D.* 30, and Johansson, *B. B.* XV, 182. It is not clear that *ηι* in βασιλήιος is a δίφθογγος κατ' ἐπικράτειαν. Kyprian μνάϊιον, C. D. I. 41, if correct, supports an Ionic μνήϊον.

Digitized by Google

ηϝι < *āvi*

Appears in Ionic as ηϊ without exception. Attic differs from Ionic in its treatment of pre-Hellenic *ēvi* and *āvi* in that the former is generally represented by ει (except in patronymics, as Αἰγῆς, Νηρῆς), the latter by η (κλῆς, λῆζομαι, λητουργός, ἦθεος, προνῆον, etc., with ει as a form common to the fourth century). Ionic represents both by ηϊ, though -ηϊδης from -ηυ- stems has been generally supplanted by -ειδης.

ἠΐων, λήϊον, ληΐη, Greg. Corinth. § 69; ληϊστής, -τύς, ληΐζομαι, Hdt. Sim. Amorg. 6, Teos 156 B 20, 21; λήϊτον, *council-hall*, ἠΐθεος, Hdt.; Ποσιδηϊών, Anakr. 6; Μηΐονες, Hdt. Θρῆϊξ, Archil. 32, Anakr. 49, 75, 96, Hipp. 42, 120 (see above on E + Ĭ). Homer has Θρηκῶν, -κεσσι, -κη, Hdt. Θρῆϊξ, Θρηΐκιος, Σαμοθρήϊκες, -ικιος. δηϊόω in Hdt. δήϊος Sol. tetr. 34_2, Tyrt. $11_{18,30}$. Theog. 552, Tyrt. 12_{12}, Mimn. 14_9 have δηόω (δηιόω) as Homer, by metrical compulsion.[1] Solon 13_{21}, δηώσας, has the Attic η.

Furthermore, in νηΐ; ἐπίνειον Hdt. VI, 116, must be incorrect (cf. Προνηΐη and Attic προνῆον); κληΐω is genuine Ionic, not κλείω, Bredow, p. 176, Greg. Corinth. *d. d. Ion.* § 3; so too κληΐδες,[2] ῥηϊδίως Hdt. IX, 2, in Mss., but ῥηστώνη, III, 136. Theognis, 239, 524, 592, 1027, 1034, has ῥηΐδιος, but ῥῆδιος, 574, 577[3]. ῥῆτερον 1370 (Hom. ῥητέρος). Τήϊος, Bechtel, 155, probably from *Τᾱϝιος (cf. Τέως). In Attic either Τῆϊοι, or Τήϊοι, according to Meisterhans,[2] 51, with ηϊ, which is an Ionic loan. γήϊνος, Sim. Amorg. 7_{21}, is not from γήϝινος, but a neologism from γῆ, which never contained ϝ. So too -γειο- is a new formation. It will be noticed that of the forms that have preserved η before ι, most once had ϝ before ι (πόληϊ, ἤια, -ηιος from non -ηυ-stems, are the exception).

χρηΐζω (Greg. Corinth. p. 441) in Hdt. and restored in the only passage where ι is omitted, VII, 38; Phokyl. 7_1, Theog. 1333 (χρῆζων 958). Whether χρέος is from *χρηϝος or *χρηιος is uncertain.[4] χρηΐσκομαι in Hdt. alone; χρηΐα (*i.e.* -ηΐη) = χρεία, Hesychios.

ἤια, Sim. Amorg. 32, from √*ves*, *eat*, Baunack, K. Z. XXVII, 561, found in Alkaios 91, ἔσσαν.

πόληϊ, Tyrt. 12^{15}, is a double locative, and not a raised form of πόλε-ι.

[1] Homeric δήοιο, δήω, δήων, δηωθέντ-, etc. So too Θρηκῶν, etc. ηϝι becomes εϊ but once in Homer (λεΐστή, I, 408). Nauck reads Θρέικες, Ω 234.

[2] Tyrt. 12_{24}, εὐκλεΐσας is not Ionic.

[3] Cf. ῥᾴδιον, Solon Eleg. 9_5 (Diod. Sic. ῥαΐδιον; ῥᾴδιον, Theog. 120, 1220, ῥᾷον 429.

[4] Wackernagel, K. Z. XXVII, 264, Danielsson, *Grammat. und etymol. Studien*, 52, and *Gramm. Anm.* I, 17.

Digitized by Google

153. E + O.

The earliest testimony to an Ionic contraction of εο is the existence in Homer of εῳ and of a few cases of ευ. In the older periods of the Greek dialects whenever the contraction of εο to ευ appears, it is to be regarded as Ionic. ευ is but sparingly attested from earlier Aiolic, but more frequently from later Doric sources (Ahrens, II, 213 ff.).

As regards the genesis of εο from ηο, it should be stated that Merzdorf's[1] distinction between pre-Hellenic *āo* = Ionic ηο = Ionic εω, and pan-Hellenic *ēo* = Ionic ηο = Ionic εο, a distinction accepted for many years by many distinguished scholars, can no longer be upheld. Cf. -ευ from masculines of Â decl. and ἱερέω < *ἱερηο. The occurrence of εο (ευ) makes it appear that the combination ηο is treated in three different ways in Ionic. (1) ηο may be retained as an archaism, see below on H + O, (2) ηο becomes εω, and (3) becomes εο. In Ionic no difference can be detected in the treatment of long vowel + short vowel whether *ϝ*, *yod*, or *sigma* intervened, though the dialect bears traces of the fact that the labial spirant disappeared later than either of the others. In Attic *metathesis quantitatis* seems to have occurred even when *sigma* or *yod* were expelled, though the cases are rare.

To a large extent the question whether εο or ευ should be written, is an orthographical question merely, at one and the same time the same word being written εο or ευ in the same portion of Ionic territory. There can be no doubt that εο was pronounced ευ more frequently than it was written.[2] Cf. εο for original ευ and αο for αυ. εου

[1] Merzdorf in Curtius' *Stud.* VIII, 163 ff., IX, 226 ff.; Wackernagel, K. Z. XXVII, 262; Schmidt, K. Z. XXVII, 297; Osthoff, *Philol. Rundschau*, I, 933; Erman, *Stud.* V, 294; Brugmann, Gramm. § 19; Bechtel, B. B. X, 280, *Ion. Insch.* p. 69, 107, 109; Johansson, D. V. C. 153, B. B. XV, 167; Fick, B. B. XI, 259 ff.; Karsten, 19–22; Blass, *Aussprache*,[3] 72.

[2] In the pseudo-Ionists εο was carefully preserved. From Lindmann, *de dial. Ionica recentiore*, p. 53, I construct the following table: —

	εο	ευ		εο	ευ
Dea Syria,	112	0	Eusebios,	4	0
Vit. auct.	6	0	Euseb. Mynd.	55	4
Astrol.	49	0	Ep. Thales,	1	0
Arrian,	118	2	Aretaios, I, II,	39	13
Abydenos,	4	0			

Digitized by Google

is occasionally found (Ἐρυσθένεους Samos 217, Ἀριστοκλέους Thasos 72_1). See § 114. The writing εο shows that ευ was not pronounced *eü*. εο especially in the -ες stems becomes ευ from about 350 B.C. Whenever in Ionic poetry εο must be read ∪∪, it is an archaism. In the early inscriptions of the same date εο occurs, both = ευ and = earlier ε + ο. The εο of φέογειν shows that the εο of γεγωνέοντες is a diphthong.

1. εϝο

Becomes in Ionic εο or is contracted to ευ. Names with νέος, κλέος, as first parts of a compound name show both forms.

νεο- in Νεοπολιτέων,[1] Neapolis 4_2, Νεοκλείδης, Styra, 19_{215}, -κλίδης, 19_{266}; -μήνιος, Olbia, Jahrb. für Philol. suppl. vol. X, 26, No. 8, Maroneia 196_{14}; Halik. 240 B 29, D 38; -μανδρος, Thasos (L.) 17_2. Cf. νέους, Arch. 55; νέοι, Kall. 1_2; νέων, Anakr. 100_3; Hdt. νέος, etc.; νέον, Samos 220_{25}; νέωτα, Sim. Amorg. 1_9 < νεϝοϝατα.

Νευ-, in -πολίτης 4_3, Neapolis (350–300); -πολιτῶν 4_4, Neapolis (350–300); Νε]υμηνίου, Olbia 131_9; Νευμην[ίου], Halik. 240 B 7. Cf. Νεοβούλης in Archil. 71 and νεομηνίᾳ, Pind. *Nem.* 4_{35} = ευ; also νευμηνία, later Kretan, and νευμεινίη, Boiot. 951. Νουμήνιος, Iasos $104_{22,48}$ (about 350 B.C.), and upon Olbian coins, is Attic.

Κλεο- in -μαχος, Styra 19_{119}; -μβρτος 44 B 10, Keos, Thasos 77 B 12; -δικος, Styra 19_{222}; -πάτρα, Delos 55, VII, 27; -κρίτου, Thasos 75 B 4; -νίκου, Smyn. 153_{19}; -ρρος, Styra 19_{230}; -μήδεος, Th. (L.) 1; -μέδων, Th. (L.) 3_{10}, 6 C 6; -[λο]χος, Th. (L.) 6 C 15; -φάν[ης], Th. (L.) 11 C 5. -κύδευς, Thasos 77 A 10; -γένης, Thasos 77 B 5; -τίμου, Chios 177_{10}.

Κλευ- in Κλεομάνδρου, Arkesine 34 (fourth century), epigram. Κλεόβουλος, Anakr. 2_9, $3_{1,2,3}$, by synezesis (Mss. ευ). κλευ- in prose is written in -πάτρα, Delos 55, III, 34; -νίκη, Pharos 87; -κρίτη, Siphnos 89; -δώρου, Hyele 172_2. Cf. Κλεόδαμον, Pind. *Ol.* 14_{22}, the names in Κλευ- in later Kretan and Rhodian documents.

-εος in the genitive of -υ- stems is closed in ἄστεος, Sim. Amorg. 7_{74}. These genitives are never written -ευς, as those of the sigmatic declension may be. -εος from ηυ-stems in βασιλέος, etc. (on ηος, see H + O). -εος < ηϝοτς in τεθνεός, Hdt. I, 112 (*Studien*, IX, 242); [illegible]ντες, Perinthos 234 B 13; Λεόντισκος, *ibid.* 234 A 4. ἵλεος, prob-[illegible] Herodotean (cf. IV, 94, VI, 91), from ἵληϝος. Cf. Kretan ἱλέος [illegible] pl.). ἵλαος is also Ionic, Archil. 75_2. See § 10, 11.

[1] [illegible]is 4_1 = Attic Νεᾶ-. In Attic the forms in νεα- outlive those in νεο-, [illegible]rom 454 to 356 B.C.

Digitized by Google

ευ from εο = εω:

θευροί, Thas. 72_2, from θεοροί; cf. ἐθεόρεον, Thas. (L.) 7_2, with θεορ- from θεωρ-. Cf. B. B. X, 282; cf. Λευτυχίδης, Hdt.[1] and πυλευρός, in Hesychios, from πυλεωρός. See Brug. *Gr. Gr.* § 19.

NOTE. — Greg. Corinth. p. 447, Gramm. Meerm. 654, August. 669, say that the Ionic form is ὁρτή, which appears in Hdt.[2] That this statement is only partially true is evident from ἑορτή, Oropos 18_{34}. That a prosthetic vowel should have the *asper* is irregular (cf. Ἑόρτιος in Attic, Roberts, 52), hence Bury's attempt at etymologizing ἑορτή has at least the vantage ground of explaining its presence: ἑορτή = ϝεϝορτή, ϝῤϝορτή, as *urvâta* from *vṛvâta*; ὁρτή on the other hand is = *vratâ*. Cf. B. B. XI, 333.

2. εσο

Yields either εο, ε͡ο, or ευ. In the Ionic poets: Archil. ἀγάλλεο 66_4, ὀδύρεο 66_5, ἀπάγχεο 67, χαρίζευ 75, ἀλέξε͡ο 66_2, γενέ͡ο 75_2,[1] Anakr. 2_9; εὔχε͡ο Phok. 3_8, ἵκε͡ο[3] Anan. 1_3. ε͡ο in Λυκάμβε͡ος, Archil. 28; θέρε͡ος, Sim. Amorg. 7_{30}, παλιντριβέ͡ος 7_{43}. Παιρισάδε͡ος, Pantikap. epigram, Kaibel 773. Cf. the Attic Παιρισάδους, Bechtel No. 119, 120; Παιρισάδου, No. 122. ευ is written in Hipponax 19_2 ῥίγευς, 49_2 τριήρευς, though no reason may be adduced why in Sim. Amorg. ε͡ο should be written, but ευ in Hipponax. Tradition is worth but little in such cases, as ευ did not come into vogue at "the stroke of twelve." The open forms still hold their ground in the Ionic poets: πολυανθέος, Mimn. 2_1; ἄνθεος, Xenoph. 1_6. For a complete chronological list of -εος, -ευς, in the genitive of κλερεσ- stems, see under *Declension.*

In derivatives from θεος,[4] Θεο-, in Θεοφῶν, Thasos 83_5; -[κλ]ίδης, Keos 44 B 6; -κύδης, Keos 46; -δωρος, Thasos 77 B 8, Olbia 131, 3, Halik. 240_{31}, Samoth. 236; -δοτος, Iasos 105_1; -δοσίη, Phanag. 164, 166, Theodosia 127 (Stephani's *Compte Rendu*, 1866, p. 128); -γείτων, Teos 159_1. Cf. *Jahrb. für Philol., Suppl.* vol. V, 487, No. 47, X, 29, No. 21. -γένευς, Thasos 78 C 5, -τιμίδης, 78 C 4, -τιμος, Styra 19_{376}. -προπος, Chios 174 C 21; -φάνης, Eryth. 206 B 63 (l. 21, 24, 26, 29, have Θευ-); -φρων, Eryth. 206 C 11 (cf. Θε[ι]όφρων, Eryth. 206 C 12); -πομπος, Th. (L.) 6 C 10.

[1] Λευκ[ά]ριος, Styra 19_{124}, regarded by Merzdorf and Wackernagel as containing Λευ- = Λεω-, is an hypocoristic name for *Λευκόκαρος.

[2] ἑορτή, Luk. *Syr.* 10, *v. l.*, with ὁρτή in the better Mss.

[3] ου in Mss.

[4] Brugmann, *Berichte d. königl. sächs. Gesell. d. Wissen.* 1889, p. 41, compares Skt. *ghōrds*. In this paper Brugmann mentions all the old etymologies of the much-disputed word θεός, except the one which I have here provisionally adopted (θεός = *θϝεσος, = Lith. *dvesti*).

Digitized by Google

NOTE 1. — In Attic we often find Θεο- in proper names in sixth, fifth, and fourth century inscriptions parallel to the same names in Θου-. See K. Z. XXIX, 138.

NOTE 2. — The ε of θεο- is sometimes omitted (Θόκλος 19_{206}, Θοδίων 19_{378}). Cf. Κλόδειπνος 19_{221}; and Megarian names in Θο-, Mitth. VIII, 189, 190. In reverse direction ο is omitted in Θεκλίδης 19_{209}. See Baunack's *Studien*, I, 229.

Θευ-.

-μαρ[ης] 16 B 25, Eretria (340–278); -βουλος, Naxos 28; -δωρος, Delos 55, 3_{30}, Keos 169_{5}, Eryth. 206 B 42, Eryth. 207, Olbia $131_{17,21}$, Teos 161 (also Θευ- in *Jahrb. für Phil. Suppl.* IV, 478, No. 16; IV, 484, No. 45; X, 31, No. 3); -προπο(ς), Miletos 102; Θευπροπίδου, Smyrna 153_{28}; -δοσίη, Pantik. 119, 120, 122, Phanag. 165, 167, 168; -γνητος, Smyrna 153_{12}; -τιμίδης, Smyrna 153_{19}; -ξεινίδης, Smy. 153_{29}; -ξενος, Eryth. 206 B 24; -δάμας, Keos 169_{2}; -δοτος, Samos 221_{4}, Eryth. 206 A 26, an almost Attic inscription; -κριτος, Eryth. 206 A 29; -πομπος, Eryth. 206 B 21; Θεόγνιδος, Theog. 22 = ευ. θεός, Sim. Amorg. 7_{1}, θεοῦ 7_{104}, and elsewhere θεός in poetry. Even in Attic: Θευδόσιος, C. I. A. II, 445 C 16 (160 B.C.).

3. εο.

εο < εο in *verbal* forms is generally contracted in old Ionic poetry, the contraction being written εο. Mss. of the lyric poets vary between εο and ευ, the Attic ου sometimes having been brought in by the copyists. See under *Conjugation* for the parallelism of εο and ευ forms. All instances of ου in Ionic documents must be regarded as foreign to the character of the dialect. εο from ᾱιω or ηιω verbs is a diphthong, as is εω, at least in the period of Ionic represented by the iambographers.

On χρέομαι, see B. B. XV, 171–173. That it is a genuine Ionic verb = Doric χρέομαι is at least open to doubt.

In *adjectival* forms: -εος.

Hdt. χρύσεος; χρύσεον 114 E 8, Zeleia; Wood, *Discov. at Ephesus*, App. 6, No. 1; Aphrodisias 254, of the imperial period; Olbia 129, 12; Latyschev, *Inscr. antiq. orae septentr. Ponti Euxini*, I, Nos. 50, 54, 57, 59, 61, 63, 64, 70 (after Christ).

This εο of late Roman times is a diphthong; in adj. of material the orthographically old form is preserved till the latest times; cf. under E + Ω, E + OI.

χάλκεον, Samos 224, an inscription otherwise Hellenistic.

λίνεος, Hdt. III, 47; λινέῳ, I, 195, but λινοῦς, Samos 220_{15}, λινοῦν 220_{25} (despite χρύσεον, l. 18). The same inscription, dating from the

Digitized by Google

middle of the fourth century, has ἀλοργοῦς, l. 23, -οῦν, l. 22, 30 (cf. Plato, Timaios, 68 C).

ἀφνεός, Theog. 188, 559, πλέος in Hdt. with some of the oblique case forms in πλευ- (see § 88, and Bredow, p. 154), ἐπιτήδεος, ἐπέτεος, βόεος, χήνεος, ἀδελφεός, adj. in -λεος, never contracted; § 130, 3 *b*; 177.

Nouns: ὤεον, Sim. Amorg. 11; ὀστέον, Hdt. χρέος, ἀξιόχρεος, are not beyond peradventure for *χρηϝος. If we assume χρη-ος, we have the ablaut χρα- in χραισμέω.

Pronouns: ἐμεῦ, Mimn. 14_2, Archil. 92; μευ, Hipp. 62, Anakr. 76, 81; τευ, Archil. 110.

σου, found Hippon. 76, μου 83, ἐμοῦ, Arch. 111, are Atticisms to be removed in favor of the forms in ευ or εο. ου in Solon is correct.

154. H + O.

ηο is sometimes preserved in Ionic when ϝ originally separated the two vowels. It is indifferent whether η = I.E.*ā* or *ē*. Such forms as do not show *metathesis quantitatis* are to be regarded as archaisms: ληόν, Hipp. 88; παιήονα, Arch. 76;[1] νηός, Arch. 4; παρήορος, Arch. 56_5 (Hdt. and Attic μετέωρος); Ἄρηος, Tyrt. 11_7 (Ἄρηο, Arch. 48, according to Fick, for Bergk's Ἄρεω).[2] On Fick's restoration Ἰόληος, etc., see § 30. Elsewhere ηο, whether = I.E. *ēvo* or *āvo*, suffers change to εω or εο (ευ): Arch. 58_4, πλέως(?); Anakr. 94, πλέῳ; Hdt. πλέος (πλεο-). It is not true that ηο < ᾱο became only εω in Ionic, and ηο = pan-Hellenic ηο, only εο.

155. E + Ω.

The ω of the diphthong εω from ηο probably did not contain two moras, as the ε on the other hand may have had greater weight than a simple vowel of a single mora. εω in Ionic and Attic, when originating from ηο, must be regarded as a diphthong with three moras, which in Ionic could become a diphthong with two moras (εο, ευ) or finally a monophthong (ω). εω generally remains a diphthong in Ionic except when a vowel precedes. When a consonant stood originally before εω, the diphthong is only in rare cases contracted. In lyric poetry open εω (and εο) is an archaism.

[1] Solon, Παιῶνος 13_{57}. Elsewhere παιών, see § 146.

[2] ϝ is here in each case the intervening consonant. πόληος alone lies outside of this category. On this form, see under *Declension*. In ἀλλΗΟν, Naxos 23 Η = open ε.

Digitized by Google

εω in Ionic comes into existence from ηο = I.E.*ēo*, and from ηο = Aiolic and Doric ᾱο. As both ηο's become εο, so may both appear under the form of εω. Cf. the remarks on E + O. On the retention in Ionic poetry of ηο where the later dialect adopts εω or εο, see under H + O.

1. εω from ηϝο.

λεώς, Hdt. Ἀρκεσίλεως, Styra 19_{15}, Λεώμβριμος 19_{38}, show that ληόν in Hipponax is a survival. The change of ᾱ to η precedes in time the *metathesis quantitatis*. πλέως, Anakr. 94, and perhaps Arch. 58_4; βασιλέων (Hom. -ήων); νεωποιέω, Samos 222; ἔωθεν, Arch. 83, while Mimn. 12_3, has the obsolescent Ἠώς.

ἱερέω, Olbia $128_{22, 23, 50}$, to which a new nominat. ἱερέως, Miletos, 100_4, has been formed. ἱερέω is the genitive of ἱερής (Ark-Kypr.). On the connection of stems in -η and -ηυ, see Bechtel, *Gött. Nachr.* 1886, 378, Smyth, A. P. A. 18, p. 79. A similar form is Ἀρεω, Archil. 48, though there εω represents the stage intermediate between εω and ω.

πόλεως (occurrences under *Declension*), a genuine Ionic form, from πόληος. Johansson, B. B. XV, 169, proposes to explain the εω of πόλεως on the theory that if the accent fell upon a syllable preceding or following ηο, εω and not ω, is the result. Cf. Attic γεω- < γη(ι)ο- in λεπτόγεως, γεωμετρία, Hdt. γεωπείνης, γεωρυχέω, γεώπεδον (γηοχέω, VII, 190).

εω originates from εϝω, not from ηϝο, ηϝω, in Κλεώνυμος, Smyrna 153_{19}, Thasos 82 B 9, from κλεϝο + ωνυμος; Ἡρακλεώτης, Eryth. 206 A 38, Halik. 241 (§ 88); Πανταλέων, Iasos 104_{30}; Κλυτιδέων, Chios 183 A 7, etc.; ἀνενεώσατο, Ephesos 147_7.

εω from ε + οϝα, ε + αϝο in νέωτα, Sim. Amorg. 1_9 < νεϝοϝατα, θεωρός, Theog. 805, Samoth. 236, from θηωρός < θηϝαϝορός.

εω from ηϝο : ηϝω in

Λεώφιλος, Archil. 69. Cf. names in Λευ-, § 28, cf. 30. κυκεῶνα, Hippon. 43_4 < *κυκῆον; τεθνεώς, Theog. 1192.

ω from original ηϝω in

ξυνωνίην, Arch. 86_2, is from ξυνέων = ξυνήων = ξυνᾱϝων. Ποσειδῶν is found Archil. 114, to which Ποσειδέων is to be preferred (Herod. π.μ.λ. 11, 5, Renner 190). The long form, Archil. 10; Ποσιδηϊών, Anakr. 6; Hdt. has Ποσειδέων.

2. εω from η(σ)ιω.

The Ionic genitive in -εω = Homeric -ᾱο, is represented on the Naxian inscription, No. 23, by ηο (ΔεινοδίκΗΟ), where HO is a diphthong, whose η is not equivalent phonetically to Homeric ᾱ.

Digitized by Google

-εω in the Ionic elegiac and iambic poets in a monosyllable: in Hdt. we have βορέω for βορέεω, on which see under *Declension.*

-ω from εω < η(σ)ιο.

Ἀννικῶ, Chios 174 C 13, Ἀσίω, *ibid.* C 27, Πυθῶ, *ibid.* D 4, Λυσῶ, *ibid.* D 17, are the result of the contraction of ε + ω reduced from εεω. With Ἀσίω, cf. Παυσανίω, Abdera 163_{16}. These genitives, as Bechtel has shown (*Ion. Insch.* 109, B. B. X, 280 ff., cf. *Declension*), do not represent a different period of the dialect from those in -εω. Those in -έεω are probably grammatical figments. Since upon the same inscription (*e.g.* 240) the forms in -εω and -ῶ occur, since -εω is a diphthong, and finally, since the ε of the genitive had not disappeared from the Ionic genitive in the third century B.C., -εω and -ῶ must be mere graphical variations of one and the same ending. Ἑρμίεω, Chios 180, and Ἀγίεω, Olbia 131, 11, seem to owe their existence to the workings of analogy. Even Hdt. has Ἑρμέω with his usual -εω.

In Πα]ναμύω, Halik. 238_{12}, 240 A 11; Πακτύω, Myl. 248 C 3, 13; Ἀρχαγορῶ, Halik. 240 B 3; Μικιννῶ 240 A 38; Βρώλω, Ditt. *Syll.* 6 D 22, we have the contraction. The genitives in -ευ from -εο < -εω probably came first into existence when -εω constituted the final syllable; and ευ gradually forced its way into medial syllables (θευροί, πυλευρός). But see Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* § 19.

εω from ησω.

εω is diphthongal in the gen. pl. Â declension. The occurrences of -εων, -ῶν, -εων, are given under *Decl.* ἀλΗΟΝ, Naxos 23, I regard not as = ηον, as Fick takes it, B. B. XI, 268, but as = εων, the H expressing the open quality of the *e* sound (cf. Dittenberger, Hermes, XV, 229; Blass, *Aussprache,*[3] 24 ff.). There appears to be no warrant for deriving -εων from -ηον, attested at best in this single instance.

NOTE. — Attic -ῶ arises from -εω (either from pan-Hellenic ηο or Attic-Ionic ηο) when either ε or ω was tonic. Ionic resisted the operation of this law until a late period in its history. Whether accent position (∠ ηο-, or -ηο ∠) should have produced εο is entirely doubtful.

εω, εω, from εσω.

ἐών, Amorg. 35, epigram, Mimn. 3; ἐών, Xenoph. 2_{11}. Adverbs in -εως: ἀδηνέως, Chios 174 B 12; Theog. 406, εὐμαρέως, σαφηνέως 963; νηλεῶς, Anakr. 75_2 (< νηλεέως); ἀσφαλέως, Archil. 58_4, 66_4; Hdt. τελέως, ἀληθέως, σαφηνέως, etc., but ἀκλεῶς, V, 77, ἀδεῶς, I, 216, etc., Diog. ἐμφανέως 4, ἀτρεκέως 6. Cf. -ῶ in the genitive from -εεω.

εω, εω, from εσω in other forms.

Digitized by Google

θεῶν, Arch. tr. 25_3, Mimn. 2_4, 9_6, Xenoph. 1_{24}, Solon 4_2, 13_3, but θεῶν 13_{30}, and Archil. 84_2, Hipponax 30 A, Anakr. 65_4. In the genitive plural of nouns of the sigmatic declension both -εων and -εων occur: Archil. ξιφέων 3_3, ὀρέων 115; Mimn. ὀχέων 12_{11}, δυσμενέων 14_8; Archil. δυσμεσέων 66_2, στηθέων 103; ἐτέων, Sim. Amorg. 1_8; ὀρέων, Anakr. 2_5.

3. εω from ηο.

διψέων (—∪—), Archil. 68, διψέωντα, Anakr. 57, according to Fick (B. B. X, 265), for διψῶντα.

χρέωμαι, the genuine Ionic form (whatever be made of Hdt.'s χρέομαι in *P.* from II, 77 on) is = *χρηιομαι. On χρᾶσθαι < χρᾰεσθαι, see § 36, 131, 139. Hdt. has χρέωνται, ἐχρέωντο, χρεώμενος. From χρῆν, *pronounce*, χρῆσθαι, *interrogate an oracle*, we have in Hdt. χρέωσα, χρεώμενος, ἐχρέωντο (*P* here too ἐχρέοντο, V, 82, VII, 141). From σμῆν, διασμέωντες, II, 37 (Stein, Kallenberg, -σμῶντες); hence ἐξέσμεων, III, 148. If νῆν is the Herodotean form, we would expect ἐπινέωσι IV, 62; if νεῖν, then ἐπινέουσι.

εω from ειω in verbs: under the head of *Contract Verbs* are given the forms in εω, εω, ω. Here too are to be classed participial nouns: προμαχεών, Hdt. (προμαχῶνες, Teos 159_9, Attic form); Ἀρκέων, Styra 19_{17}; Κωλέων, 19_{237}; Φιλεωνίδ[ε]ος, Thasos 73.

Adjectives denoting a material retain the uncontracted form until far into the imperial period. ἀργυρέω, Olbia 129_{12}; χρυσέωι, Ephes. 147_9; χρυσέω, Latyschev, *Inscr. antiq. orae septentr. Ponti Eux.* I, No. 67, Wood, *Discov. at Ephesus*, App. 6, No. 1. But χρυσέω, Mimn. 11_6, and one case of -ῶ, Latyschev, *l. l.* No. 57. Adjectives in -λεος with but a few exceptions fail to contract any form: ἀργαλέῳ, Tyrt. 12_{28}. See § 130 *b*. In the pronominal declension we find ἡμέων, ὑμέων; see Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* § 96.

Suffix -εων in ἀνδρεών, ποδεών, φαρετρεών, etc., in Hdt.

εω where no consonant intervened:

ἀφέω, Hipponax 75, from *ἀφήω; εἰδέωσιν, Halik. 238_{21}, Demokr. 87, whose εω is diphthongal despite the absence of contraction, and is = εἰδῶσιν, Ephesos 147_{17} (300 B.C.). Cf. εο in γεγωνέοντες, Chios 174 B 12. Original ειω becomes εω, *e.g.* in the subj.: δοκέωσιν, Sim. Amorg. 7_{97}; τραπέωσι καὶ πατέωσιν, Ananios 5_4; παραπιτνῶσι, Samos 220_{22}.

156. H + O.

The Ionic developed a pronounced objection to η with following vowel. See above, on εο, εω.

Digitized by Google

157. H + Ω.

ηω is preserved as an archaic form; *e.g.* in Ἠώς, Mimn. $12_{2,10}$, and in Hdt. through the protection offered by ϝ (ἠώς from *ἄυσως, K. Z. XXX, 422, No. 2). On Archil. 83 ἔωθεν, see Bartholomae, K. Z. XXIX, 522. Elsewhere H + (ϝ, ι̯, σ) + Ω becomes εω, whether η = ᾱ or pan-Hellenic η.

158. E + Y.

The elegy still preserves ἐῡ, if the possibility of reading ⏑⏑ may be regarded as a criterion (ἐυπλοκάμου, Arch. 11; ἐυφροσύνη, Xenoph. 1_4; ἐυστεφάνου, Theog. 1339; cf. 548, 574), while ε̄ῡ is permitted (Archil. 19, Theog. 639, 845, etc.). Iambic poetry records ε̄ῡ in εὔφρων, Sim. Amorg. 7_{99}, εὐτυχεῖ 7_{83}.

159. O + A.

1. ορᾰ.

χειρωναξιέων, Hdt.; Σιμώνακτος, Hippon. 55 B (= Σημω-?); Ἱππώνακτος, Hipp. 13; Ἀριστώνακτος, Chios 177_{10}; Ἑρμῶναξ, Iasos 104_{14}, Eryth. 206 B 13; Δημώνακτος 206 B 21, Thas. (L.) 4 B 10, 14_3, Thasos 81 B 4; Τιμῶναξ, Thasos 75 B 4. It seems not incredible that in most of these compound proper names the termination -ωναξ is due to the influence of such names as Πυθῶναξ (which rests upon Πύθων); and that there seemed to be an echo of the vocative ὦναξ in the names of the Ionian democrats. See Wackernagel, K. Z. XXIX, 143.

πρῶτος (perhaps from *πρωϝατος), Keos 43_{16}, Styra 19_{47}; ὠσί, Anakr. 21_4, *ὀατσι < Hom. οὐατ-, οὐσατ-. See Schmidt's *Neutra*, p. 407.

ο(ϝ)α uncontracted in ἀκήκοα. νεοάλωτοι, Hdt. IX, 120, is felt to be a compound.

2. οσᾰ

= ω in κακίω, Archil. 6_4; κρέσσω, Anan. 3_3; ἀμείνω, Theog. 409 [πλείω 907, not certain]. Hdt. has ἐλάσσω, καλλίω, ἀμείνω, πλέω, etc., as well as the ν forms. Hdt. αἰδῶ, I, 8 (Greg. Corinth. § 35, says αἰδοῦν is Ionic); ἠῶ, Hdt. II_8.

3. *Crasis* (cf. Greg. Corinth. § 29): τὠρχαῖον, ὠνήρ, τὤγαλμα, etc., in Hdt. render ἄμ, Thasos 68 A, very noticeable, if Fick (*G. G. A.* 1883, 126) is correct in regarding it as = ὁ ἄμ. ο + α results in α in Elean, Argolic, Korinthian, and in other Doric dialects. In Attic we find α in Ἀθηναῖος, τἄγαλμα, *Mitth.* III, p. 230, 5 (before 343 B.C.),

Digitized by Google

and also ω in πρῶτος,[1] τὠγάλματος, C. I. A., I, 322 A 75 (transcribed by Kirchhoff, τοῦ(ἀ)γ-). The parallelism of Attic and Ionic makes it probable that ο + α may become ω and α. Ἀμοιβίχου = ὁ Ἀμ-, Abu-Simbel (Roberts 130) cannot be introduced in evidence, since the name is not that of an Ionian. Absence of crasis is frequent upon the inscriptions; *e.g.* τὸ ἄδος, Halik. 238_{19}. οι + α in ὦλλοι,[2] ὦνθρωποί; ου + α in τὠπόλλωνος, Chalkis 13_{12}, Halik. 238_{36}, Naukratis, Roberts 132 E; τὠγῶνος, Teos 156 B 32; but τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, Amphip. 10_{13}, Eretria 15_{15}, Milet. 98, τοῦ Ἀφυάσιος, Halik. 238_{4}. With τἀπόλλων[ος], Naukratis, Roberts 132 G; cf. ἄμ above.

160. O + Â.

In accus. pl. of Â stems ο + ᾱ < ανς remains uncontracted.

161. Ω + A.

Σῶνδρος, Amorg. 32 rather from < σωυ = σω before vowels (Spitzer, Arkad. 43, 44), than from σασο. See § 144. Hdt. has ἥρων for ἥρωα. Ὠρίων, Miletos 93 (Pindar Ὠαρίωνα) and in Homer, though Nauck proposes to substitute Ὠαρῖων- for Ὠρῖων-. Cf. Menrad, p. 13.

By *crasis:* ὦνθρωπε, Hdt., Theog. 453; ὦναξ, Hdt.; τὠπόλλωνι, Miletos 96, 97, Naukratis 139 B = Roberts 132 *ter.*; τὠντικνήμιον, Hippon. 49_{6}; τῶι Ἀπολλ[ωνί]ω, Mil. 93 and Halik. 238_{45}, an inscription that refuses to follow the crasis laws.

162. O + E.

1. οϝε yields οε and ου in the poets. Arch. ἱμερόεντα 8, στονόεντα 9_{1}, αἱματόεν 9_{8}; Mimn. ἀλγινόεσσαν 11_{2}, αἱματόεντος 14_{7}; Anakr. δακρυόεσσαν 31, κεροέσσης 51_{2}, δακρυόεντα 94_{2}; Xenoph. ἀλγινόεσσαν 2_{4}; Phok. ἱμερόεντος 3_{8}; ἀνθεμεῦντας (ου?) Anakr. 62_{2}, χαριτεῦν (ου?) 44, Βατου-σιάδης Arch. 104_{2} < Βατοῦς = Βατόεις, the only examples of contraction in forms of -οεις, *i.e.* ο + spurious ει; see § 179.

In the compound τε(σ)σερακαιεβδο[μη]ϝοντούτης, Paros 58, οϝε is contracted, and in the adjectival and participial formations: Τειχιού(σ)σης, Miletos 98 (Τειχιοϝετῑης); Μαραθοῦντα, Eryth. 201_{26}; θανοῦσαν 264, Adesp., στέγουσαν, Keos 47_{12}; in Hdt. Οἰνοῦσσαι, Σελινούσιοι, Συρακούσιοι (on Συρακόσιος, see above, § 123). οε in Μολόεντα, Σολόεντος, Αἰγιρόεσσα, μελιτόεσσα, Hdt. So too in εὐνοέστερον, V, 24.

[1] Unless πρῶτος is for *πραϝατος.

[2] Cf. Et. Mag. 821_{39}.

Digitized by Google

The concurrence of a stem in ε/ο and of -εργο or -ϝεντ-, as the latter member of a compound, is dealt with in the dialects in different ways. The original ablaut form, -ϝοργός, gave way at an early period to -ϝεργός, as is shown by Homeric δημιοεργός Τ 383. See *Studien*, VIII, 213, § 20, 21, A. P. A. XVIII, 95, 158, Meister, II, 41, Bennett 28 ff.

I. The vowels are uncontracted.

ὀβριμοεργῶν, Kallin. 3; ἀγαθοεργοί, Hdt. I, 67; λυκιοεργέας, VII, 76; Σ]ελινόεντ[ι], Megara C. D. I. 3045 A B_9; Ὀπόεντι, Lokris C. D. I. 1478 B 33.

II. The vowels are contracted.

(A) ο + ε becomes ου.

παναλουργέα, Xenoph. 3_3; Λυκοῦργος, Styra 19_{15}; ὑπουργέω, ξυλουργέω, Hdt. (Stein, *Preface*, liii); ἐριουργῆσαι, *Vit. Hom.* 4; ξοανουργίης, Luk. *Syr.* 34; μουσουργίης, *Astr.* 10, *vit. auct.* 3; λειτουργοί, Arrian 12; ὑπουργήματα, Euseb. Mynd. 10; ὑπουργῆσαι, Hipp. ep. 14_1. Τηιουργός, Μιλησιουργής, Χιουργής, in the inventory of the temple of the Delian Apollo (B. C. H. VI, 29 = Ditt. *Syll.* 367), are too late (185–180 B.C.) to be placed in evidence. So too in North Greek, δαμιουργός, Phokis (Ditt. *Syll.* 294_{39}), of the second century and Argolic, *l. l.* 389_{26}; Kameiros in Rhodes, *Revue Arch.* XIV, 333, No. 59; Lokris, Ὀπούντιοι C. D. I. 1503, 1504 A B, 1505, 1509 B, 1510; Ὀποῦντι 1502_3 (all late); Σελινούντιος C. D. I. 3044, Megara (so Bechtel edits, but in his note suggests Σελινοντ-). The Megarian dialect contracted ο + ε to ου even in an early period (the inscription is written βουστροφηδόν).

(B) ο + ε becomes ω according to some scholars (Roehl, G. Meyer, Blass) where syllabic hyphaeresis is preferable. ω is however certain in: ἀμπελωργικά, Herakl. Tables II, 43; Τελφῶσσα, a spring in Boiotia, Ahrens I, 173.

NOTE. — Contraction to ευ has been assumed on the strength of Καρικευργέος, Anakr. 91, as written by Bergk for Strabo's Καρικοεργ-. This contraction belongs in the same class as ἐδικαίευν with hyper-Ionic ευ.

III. One of the vowels is lost either by syllabic hyphaeresis, or by the lightening of -ϝωργ- to -ϝοργ-, ōντ to -ον̄τ (never to -εντ).

(A) ε is expelled in ἀλοργήν, Samos $220_{15, 16, 19}$, ἀλοργά 220_{36}, ἀλοργοῦς 220_{23}, ἀλοργοῦν $220_{22, 30}$, ἀλοργάς 220_{28}, παραλοργές 220_{21}, δημιοργοῦ 220_{29} (cf. *Rhein. Mus.* XXII, 313); ἱροργίαι, the reading of *ABC* in Hdt. V, 83. In the other dialects we find δαμιοργός, Andania,

Digitized by Google

Cauer 47_{116}, first century; Megara *Mitth.* VIII, 191, No. 5; Aigosthenai, Cauer 104_{19} (III, C); Knidos, Cauer 166_{7} (I, C); Kameiros, Cauer 187_{1} (conj.);[1] Astypalaia, *B. C. H.* VIII, 26 B 7, 8; Telos, Cauer 169_{2}; Argos, Cauer 48 (conj.) (V, C); Arkadia, C. D. I. 1181_{9} (III, C), *B. C. H.* VII, 488, *Mitth.* VI, $304_{3,9}$; Achaia (Ditt. *Syll.* 182_{13} (II, C), 242_{21} (II, C), *B. C. H.* II, 97 l. 16; Lokrian, C. D. I. 1476_{2-3}; Oianthea, C. D. I. 1479 B 15 (V, C), 1480 (V, C), Pamphylia, C. D. I. 1260 (late), 1261 (late). Also in Ὀλόντιοι in Krete, C. I. G. 2554_{3}, Ὀ]ποντίων, C. D. I. 1478 A 11, cf. 14 (V, C) (Ὀπόεντι B 33), as we find ΟΠΟΝΤΙΩΝ on the older coins; Σελινόντιος, as Bechtel proposes to read C. D. I. 3044, Megara, instead of -ουντιος.

(B) ο is expelled.

δαμιεργός, Nisyros, Ditt. *Syll.* No. 195 (about 200 B.C.); λινεργής, Lykophr. 716. Both are doubtless due to the influence of ἔργον. Cf. § 20.

In infinitives of -οω verbs ο + ϝεν (or σεν) or ο + spurious ει, has invariably yielded ου. ὀρκοῦν, Halik. 238_{26}; βεβαιοῦν $240_{4,5}$; also ο + ϝεν = ου as in δοῦ(ν)αι, Priene 144_{8}; διδοῦν, Oropos $18_{21,33}$, Thasos 72_{11}. ῥιγοῦν, Hdt. V, 92, η = Attic ῥιγῶν (ῥιγω + εν); ῥιγοῦν, after Plato. We should expect ῥιγῶν in Hdt.

2. οσε

Becomes ου regularly; *e.g.* μείους, Xenoph. 3_{4}; ἀμείνους V, 78, πλέους II, 8, 120, are the only contracted forms in Hdt. of the nom. pl. of these comparatives.

3. οιε.

In verbs in -οω, οιε invariably becomes ου. See under *Conjugation*.

4. *Crasis:* οε suffers contraction when no spirant intervenes. In lyric poetry: προεκπονῇ, Sim. Amorg. 22_{1}; προὔθηκε, Arch. tr. 38; προὔπινεν, Hippon. tr. 39_{3}, προὔδωκα, Theog. 529; not contracted in the Ionic of Hdt. Lukian *Syr.* 24, Hippokr. ep. 17_{34}, have προὐ-; but Arrian *Ind.* 19, 22, 34, Euseb. Mynd. 21, 41, Epist. Hipp. 27_{19}, προε-. Κλεουμπόρου, Lampsakos 171, from κλεο + ἔμπορος.

Crasis occurs also in οὔτερος, Hdt. I, 34; τοὔτερον, Hdt. and Sim. Amorg. 7_{113}; τοὐναντίον, Euseb. Mynd. 2; but τὸ ἐλάχιστον, Hdt. II, 13, τὸ ἔσχατον, VII, 229, τὸ ἔδαφος, VIII, 137. ου + ε in τοὐρμοκράτεος, Prokon. 103; οὔνεκ', Sol. tr. 37_{5}, Theog. 854, 1349; τοὔνεκα, Theog. 488; τοὔνεκεν, Xenoph. 2_{19}; τοὔνεκα, Luk. *Syr.* 33, 39, 54. This ου is not a diphthong. *Aphaeresis* in ποταμοῦ 'πανέρχομαι, Anakr. 23.

[1] For δαμιΟΥΓήσας.

Digitized by Google

163. O + H.

1. *οϝη.*

ὀγδωκονταέτη, Sol. 20_4. Cf. *ὀγδοήκοντα*, Kaibel 120_3; Hdt. *ὀγδώκοντα* (Eustath. Il. 288 = 218), through influence of *ὀκτώ*. See § 76.

βῶσαι, *ἐβώσθη*, etc. in Hdt.; *ἔβωσε*, Hippon. tr. 1, 1, for *ἐβόησε* of the Mss. Homer has *βώσαντι*, Anakr. 60, *ἐπίβωτον*. That the contraction is not thoroughgoing is evident from Anakr. 100_2, *ἐβόησε*. *ἐννώσας*, *ἐννώσαντα*, etc., Hdt. (Greg. Corinth. § 94, Eustath. Il. 288 = 218); *νωσάμενος*, Theog. 1298; *νενωμένος*, Anakr. 10; *νώσωνται*, Sim. Amorg. 1_{17} (conj.). This contraction is sporadic (*προνοήσας*, Sol. 13_{67}, *νοῆσαι* 16, and often in Hdt.). *οϝη* is retained in *ἀθρόην*, Arch. 35, etc.

There seems to be no ground for the contention that *βῶσαι* and *ἐννώσας* do not stand for *βοῆσαι*, etc., but are comparable to Homeric and Herodotean *ζώω* and have themes ending in *ω*.

NOTE. — *βοηθέω* (or *-οέω*?), in Aiolic *ἐβᾱθόη*, is not paralleled by an Ionic *βωθ-*. Hdt. has *βοηθέω*, and so *βοηθήσω* in Eryth. 204_{15}.

2. *οϝη.*

Contracted in *ἀλλογνώσας*, Hdt. I, 85, perhaps through influence of *ἀγνώμων*, *ἀγνωμοσύνη*. *μισθῶτον* < *μισθόητον*; *μισθόηι* = *μισθοῖ*. Hdt. uses neither *διπλόη* nor *διπλῆ*, but Hippokrates has *διπλόη* as a substantive.

164. Ω + E.

ωϝε.

ὤεον, Sim. Amorg. 11. Cf. Sappho, *ὤϊον*; Hdt. *ᾠόν*, II, 68 (Stein, though many Mss. omit the *iota*); Hesychios quotes *ὤβεον* as Argolic.

Aphaeresis in *ὦ 'ταῖρε*, Arch. tetr. 85.

165. O + I.

1. *οϝι*

Becomes *οϊ* and *οι* in Ionic poetry: *ὀϊζύς*, Arch. 52; *ὀϊζυροί*, Theog. 65; and so we generally read in Ionic prosaists. *οι* in *οἰζυρόν*, Sim. Amorg. 7_{50}; *τρισοιζύρην*, Archil. 129; *i.e.* about 700 *οϊ* could become *οῖ*.

οἰωνός, not *ὀιωνός*, Theog. 545, Solon 13, 56, Hdt. *ὀΐω* < *ὀϝιω*, from *ὄϝις*, *bird*, which lies at the base of *οἰωνός* (Hintner, *K. Z.* XXVII, 607), is not found in Ionic outside of Homer.

οἷς: monosyllabic nouns that contain a diphthong, separated originally by *ϝ*, are in Homer generally dissyllabic in the nominative and accusative cases, but refuse to admit the diaeresis in the oblique

Digitized by Google

cases. This holds good in Ionic poetry as late as the sixth century, at least, in the case of παῖς. ὄις ὄιες, ὄιν ὄϊς, are the rule in Homer; but in the other cases both οϊ and ο̄ι occur. For the later Ionic it is difficult to say which form should have the preference, on account of the paucity of poetical forms. ὄϊος is a conjecture, Anan. 5_6, for οἷος; otherwise we have no evidence. Stein (*Preface*, liii) maintains that ὄϊς, οἴεος, are the correct Herodotean forms, while Bredow (p. 173) writes οϊ in all cases, even in ὀΐσπη, ὀϊέῃσι. But if παῖς is the Ionic form of the fifth century, it is difficult to see why Bechtel's οἶν, Thasos 68 A, is not correct.

ὀϊστός is written in Hdt. by Bredow and Stein; Λητοΐδης, Theog. 1120; ἀθροΐζομαι, Archil. 60, 104.

2. οι̯ε.

καταπροΐξεσθαι (cf. προΐσσομαι, Arch. 92, 130); προῖκα, Myk. 92_{15} (Makedonian period). Ionic προΐξ, Et. Mag. 495_{32}, a form found in the spurious Hipponaktian fragment, 72.[1]

3. οσι.

αἰδοίην, Epigr. adesp. 264; αἰδοῖος, Archil. 63_1.

166. Ω + I.

Except in suffix syllables (-ωϊος-), ω before ι is preserved as an archaism in the earlier phases of Ionic poetry by the echo of the lost ϝ, as in

λωΐων, Sim. Amorg. 7_{30}; λώϊον, Theog. 424, 690, as in Homer; λώϊος 800, λώϊα 853, but λῷα 96 (see Bergk on v. 800); θωϊή, Arch. 109 = θωή (cf. Lokrian θώϊ' ἔστω, or θωιήστω, in ΘΟΙΕΣΤΩ, C. D. I. 1479_9; ἀθώιον, Thasos 71_6); ζωΐων, Sim. Amorg. 13_2, the only instance of the open form (cf. ὤεον in Sim.), elsewhere ζῷον, as in Hdt. some Mss. having ζῶιον, ζῶον. See M. U. I. 8. φώϊδας, according to Renner 186, Hipponax 59; Bergk, φῷδας. Perhaps we should write φῶι̯δας. σωΐζω, Hdt. with the ι that is often found on Attic inscriptions.

Adjectives in -ωϊος: πατρώϊος, Greg. Corinth. p. 441, Theog. 521, Delos 53 epigram, 264 unc. loc.; πατρῴας, Theog. 888, 1210, and so often in Mss. of Hdt. though ωϊ appears to be genuine Ionic of the fifth century. Thus we read πατρώϊος, μητρώϊος, ἡρώϊος, Hdt. (Bred. 175); ἠρώϊον, Eryth. 201_6 (cf. ἥρωϊ); πρωΐην, Hdt. VIII, 6,

[1] On the relation of προΐσσομαι to προΐκτης, see Ascoli *Krit. Stud.* p. 332_{14} (Germ. ed.), Fick, B. B. VIII, 330.

Digitized by Google

as πρωΐ, IX, 101. From the Mss. of Hdt. it is impossible to determine beyond any doubt whether -ωϊος or -ῳος was the actual form. Most editors write the forms as given above, while for ῳ a preference may be made out in the case of ἠῷος (= ἠοῖος), a poetical word used by the historian, Ἀχελῷος,[1] Τρῳάς, Κῷος (on Κέος, see above, § 152), ᾠόν.

167. I + E.

ισε in ἱερ- in Hdt.'s ἀρχιερεύς, καλλιερέω, Ἱερώνυμος; as regards ἱερός the Mss. of Hdt. have ιε in the majority of instances, but ῑ in some cases without any variant. Hekataios, 284, has ἱρός. The latter derives a weak support from Greg. Corinth. (§ 66), who states that ιε = ῑ in Ionic, but quotes ἱερέας in § 67. The text of Herodotos, in reproducing the occurrence of both Homeric forms, cannot *per se* be held to guide us to the genuine Ionic form in use in the fifth century. The testimony of the poets is without great weight: Sim. Amorg. 7_{56}, ἱρά with *v. l.* ἱερά; 24_2 ἱρωστί (conj.); Anan. 1_3 ἱερῶν; (a very obstinate passage), Archil. ἱερ- 18, Solon 4_{12}, Theog. 545. In the inscriptions we find but few cases of ῑρο-, but these occur in the three geographical divisions of Ionic: Ἱρομνήμων, Abdera 163_7, before 400;[2] Ἱρή, or Ἱρή, 267 adesp.; Amphip. 10_{13}, ἱρόν (367 B.C.), a sure proof that ῑρο is Ionic; ΙΗΡΟΝ = ἱρόν, Thasos 70, ἱρόν 71_9, (ἰ)ρεῖ 71_{11} (but ἱερέα l. 7). ἱερ- is far more frequently attested: —

500–400 B.C.: Eretr. $15_{14, 19}$, Oropos 18 (18 times), Miletos $100_{4, 6, 7}$, Amorgos 230, Halik. $238_{3, 36}$.

400–300 B.C.: Keos 48; Thasos 71_7 (also ἱρο-); Miletos 102, 2; Iasos $104_{14, 16}$; Zeleia $113_{37, 38}$; Pantik. 119, 122, 123; Theodosia 127; Ephesos 147_{14}; Eryth. $201_{5, 24}$, $204_{23, 32, 33}$; Samos 221_{37}; Mylasa 248 B 8, C 4, 8, Chios, *B. P. W.* 1889, p. 1195, l. 20.

300–200 B.C.: Thasos $72_{10, 11, 14}$; Olbia 128; Eryth. 206 very many forms. In still later times: Ephesos 150 (Hadrian), Teos $158_{15, 16, 22}$.

From this evidence we cannot but conclude that both forms existed contemporaneously in Ionic, and that it is in vain that we attempt to draw a sharp line between them. As long as the only form that we have from Chalkidian has ῑ, and as long as the genuineness of the Thasian and the Abderite ῑ is unassailed, it is beyond the lines of sound argument to hold with Fritsch that ἱρός in Herodotos is borrowed from

[1] Perinthos 234 B 23, and a Samian coin in Brit. Mus. *Num. Chron.* 1882, 255, have Ἀχελώιος.

[2] This disproves Erman's statement, *Stud.* V, p. 297.

Digitized by Google

the epic, and that ἱρός in Homer is Aiolic. If evidence of inscriptions and Mss. is to be taken for anything, Hdt. used both forms as he used κεῖνος and ἐκεῖνος.

The pseudo-Ionists fluctuate to such a degree that their testimony can scarcely be brought into court. There appears to be a slight predominance of the open form, which is the sole form in the *Vita Hom.*

Whether ἷρηξ is contracted from ἱέραξ, or whether ἷρηξ is the older form, is still uncertain.

NOTE. — The explanation of ἱρός from *ἰσρός is shattered by the Aiolic ἶρος; ἰσρός would have become, and remained, in that dialect, ἶρρος.

168. I + H.

πολίτης is of course not contracted from πολιήτης, as was formerly held; a view as incorrect as that of the pleonasm of the η (Bekker, Anecd. II, 524). ιϛη in μελιήδης, etc.

169. Υ + I.

υῖ in the dative of υ stems, occasionally υῖ (ἰλυῖ, Theog. 961), as Homeric ὀιζυῖ. υῖ also in πολυιδρείῃσιν, Theog. 703, etc.

III. Combination of Vowels and Diphthongs, and Diphthongs and Diphthongs (*crasis*).

The combinations of vowels and diphthongs will be treated in the following order: —

α + αι,	α + ει,	α + οι,	α + αυ,	α + ευ,	α + ου.
ε + αι,	ε + ει,	etc.	etc.	etc.	etc.
ο + αι,	ο + ει,				
η + αι,	η + ει,				
ω + αι,	ω + ει,				

Combinations of αι + αι, αι + αυ, etc., are placed under the head of α + αι, etc. ηι, ωι, have been classed under the head of η, ω, above § 127.

170. A + AI.

αι + αι = αι in καἰετός, Arch. ep. 86 (*v. l.* καὶ αἰετός).

Digitized by Google

171. A + EI.

1. αρει. A. Genuine ει.

ἀεικής, Hdt.,[1] Hippokr. ΠΔΟ 44, Sol. tr. 36_{11}, eleg. 5_4, Theog. 811; ἀεικέλιος, Sol. 4_{25}. ἄϊκῶς X 336, does not show that ᾰ + ε + ι can become ᾰ + ῐ; but that ᾰ + ῐ (ἀρικής) may remain open or be contracted, as in αἰκιζοίμεθα, Sim. Amorg. 1_{24}, which cannot be derived from ἀεικ-. The presence of this shorter form and the composition of the word prevented ἀεικ- from being contracted to ᾳκ-. αἰκέλιος, Theog. 1344, may be a parallel form to ἀεικέλιος (cf. Smyth, A. J. P. VI, 439). Lukian has both ἀεικής and ἀεικέλιος.

ἀείδω, Hdt., Arch. tetr. 57, Anakr. 65_3, Sol. 20_3, Theog. 533, 939 (Schneid., Mss. ᾷδ-), 1065, etc. α + genuine ει when contracted can yield only ᾳ, never ᾱ: Archil. 123 (ᾷδων), Anakr. 45_2 ᾷδω, Theog. 243 ᾷσονται, as Hymn VI, 2. The contraction of α + genuine ει(ᾳ)[2] is as old in Ionic as that of α + spurious ει(ᾱ). ἀείδω in Hdt. is perhaps due to the μεταχαρακτηρισμός, which affected archaic forms. Lukian has the open form in every case. So too ἐπαΐω in Hdt. (III, 29) should give place to ἐπᾴω. Herakl. 73 has still the older form according to Bywater. See Schulze, K. Z. XXIX, 253 ff.

B. α + spurious ει either remains open or is contracted in Ionic to ᾱ. Ignorance of this fact has led to great confusion in the minds of dialectologists and editors of Herodotos as to the propriety of admitting αἴρω into the text of the lyric poets and of Herodotos. Homer has both ἀείρω and αἴρω, and both forms must be accepted as genuine Ionic. That the Mss. of Hdt. prefer ἀείρω to αἴρω, and that ἀείδω and ἀεικής are always read in the text of the historian, have led Dindorf and Stein to adopt ἀείρω, though its ει has nothing in common with that of ἀείδω or ἀεικής. ἀείρω is attested as follows: Archil. 94, παρήειρε; Luk. *d. d. S.* § 36, 52, *Astr.* 11, Abydenos 5, Euseb. Mynd. 9, 33, have αει, and so Aretaios, 216, 224, 132, 265 (elsewhere the other forms). The contracted forms, ἄρειεν, Sim. Amorg. 7_{60}; ἐπᾶρει, Ephesos 145 A 2; ἐπᾶρας, 145 A 9.[3] αἴρω is found in Hippokrates ΠΚ, 165, 413, EI, 178; ἐπῆρται, ΠΚ, 294; ἐπῆρτο, EI, 192; ἐπήρθη, EI, 187, 194; ξυνήρει, EI, 169.

ἀείρω and αἴρω are to be separated, so far as their genesis is con-

[1] I see no reason for following Fritsch (*V. H. D.* p. 20) in his refusal to accept ἀεικείη as Herodotean.

[2] Cf. ᾳ in Attic from αι ι, § 38.

[3] Hdt. Mss. have ἀρθείς more frequently than ἀερθείς. The latter, Luk. *Astr.* 15.

Digitized by Google

cerned, the former representing *ἀ-ϝερ-ι̯ω*, the latter *ϝr̥-ι̯ω* (Brugmann, K. Z. XXVII 197; Solmsen, K. Z. XXIX 355). In Attic *αἴρω* got the upper hand. Though the desire to rescue open forms for Herodotean Ionic, and to exclude contract forms, has led to the exclusion of *αἴρω*, the genuine interrelation of the forms offers no obstacle to its acceptation. Whether or not it has been inserted by copyists on the strength of the Homeric form, is another question. It is, however, probable that both forms have a claim to existence in the Ionic dialect of the fifth century.

α + *ει* uncontracted in *δαείς*, Solon, 13_{50}, and *Κάειρα*, Δ 142 and Hdt., the masculine form of which is derived from *Κᾰήρ Κᾰερός*, etc. (Lugebil, B. B. X, 303). *α* + spurious *ει* = *ᾱ* in Attic *φανός* (Lukian *φαείνομαι*, *Syr.* 32), in Hom. Att. *δανός*, and perhaps in infinitives in *-ᾶν*; see § 179.

2. *α̯ει* (*ει* genuine) = *ᾱ* in *τιμᾷ* (Doric *τιμῇ*).

172. A + OI.

ᾰροι remains open in *ἀοιδός*, Hdt., Xenoph. 5_4, Solon 29; *ἀοιδή*, Hdt., Theog. 251, 791; *ἀοίκητος*, Hdt.

Contraction ensues in *ᾠδή*, Sol. 1_2, Hippokr. AAL, 23, EI, 186, as Hymn V, 495; *ῥαψῳδός*, Bechtel 260, found at Dodona, but ultimate provenance unknown. Crasis of *α* + *οι* omitted, *e.g.* *τὰ οἰκ[ί]α*, Halik. 238_{25}.

AI + OI in *κο[ἰ]νοπίδης*, Chios, 174 C 22, Blass, others, *κ' Ο[ἰ]νοπίδης*; *καὶ οἰκίων*, Halik. 238_{29}.

173. A + AY.

Crasis in *ταὐτά*, Eryth. 204_{13}, and in Hdt., but many cases of *τὰ αὐτά* in Hdt., *e.g.* IV, 114. So Miletos 100_4; Zeleia 113_{27}.

AI + AY. *αἱ αὐταί*, Hdt. V, 69; *καὐχένα*, Theog. 536; *καὐτάγρετοι*, Sim. Amorg. 1_{19}; *καὐτός*, Teos 158_{15}; but several cases of *καὶ αὐτός* in Teos 156 A and B and Amphipolis 10.

174. A + OY.

τιμῶσι, Ionic-Attic (*ου* spurious).

AI + OY: *κοὐκ*, Theog. 1342; Sol. 13_{60}; Hippon. tetr. 83; *κοὐνομάκλυτον*, Sim. Amorg. 7_{87}; see § 120, note 2.

Digitized by Google

175. E + AI.

ε(ϝ)αι in Κλεαίνετος, Naukratis 139 C; [συγ]χέαι, Halik. 238_{28}.

ε(σ)αι in Hdt. is not contracted in verbs in -εω. Theog. 252 has ἔσσῃ. εαι for εεαι in Hdt. (*Studien* VI, 128), δινέαι, Anakr. 12 B, from δινέεαι. Is δινέῃι correct here? I have not observed an instance of 2 pers. sing. pres. mid. (Attic βούλει after 378 B.C.).

εῖαι in adj., even those denoting a material, = αι: λιναῖ, Samos 220_{21}; ἀργυρᾶι, Latyschev, *Inscr. orae septentr. Ponti Euxini*, I, No. 67. In these adj. -εωι remains open. Hdt. μνέαι; γέαι, Zeleia 113_{40}.

176. E + EI.

1. ερει remains open in ῥέει, Mimn. 5_1, πλέει πλέειν, Hdt.; is contracted in δεῖ, Hippon. 6, Anakr. 98, Teos, 158_8. Hdt. has εἴκοσι and not the epic ἐείκοσι, as Xenoph. 7. ε + spurious ει = ει in ΚΛΕνοφάνης, Keos, 44 A 11; ΚΛΕν[ο]γένης, Keos, 45; Κλέσιος, Miletos, 98; Κλείανδρος, Thas. (L.), 16_5; κλεινός in Solon, 19_3.

2. εῖει is found in the open forms in Herodotos, *e.g.* δοκέει, δοκέειν, in direct opposition to the language of the inscription (see -εω verbs). The only examples in poetry are κερτομέειν, Arch. 64; φιλέειν 80, Sim. Amorg. δοκέει 1_9, where the metre in each case calls for -εῖ or -ἔει.

ἀδείη, Hdt. VIII, 120, etc. < *ἀδεείη.

177. E + OI.

1. εροι. Hdt. πλέοι, ἔμπλεοι.

2. εσοι in θεοί (§ 153, 2), Hipponax 93, Theog. 142, elsewhere θεοί, Archil. eleg. 9_5, Solon $13_{9,55}$; θεοῖς, Archil. tetr. 56; θεοῖσι 55; Tyrt. 5_1, Solon 11_2, 35.

3. εῖοι in -εω verbs is contracted in lyric poetry and in inscriptions, except in ἀνωθεοίη, Teos 156 A_{11}, with obsolete orthography. Hdt. has both forms (καλέοι, φρονέοιεν; ποιοῖ, ἐπιχειροῖεν, φοβοῖτο), the latter representing the ordinary Ionic of the fifth century. See under -εω verbs.

In adjectives of material, εοι is kept open, even in the imperial period: ἀργύρεοι, Wood, *Discoveries at Ephesus*, App. 6, No. 1; χρυσέοις, Latyschev, *Inscr. Ponti Euxini*, I, No. 22, C. I. G. 2059. Adjectives in -αλέος rarely contract; αὐχαλέοι, Xenoph. 3_5, but γηράλεοι, Anakr. 43_2. See § 153.

Digitized by Google

178. E + OY (spurious).

1. ερου.

πλέους, Hdt. I, 194; πλέου, Melissos, § 14; Κλεουμπόρου. Lampsakos 171, with ου from ο + ε.

2. εσου.

ἐούσης, Mylasa 248 C 5, etc., as μεδεούσηι, Phanag. 164, Samos 216.

θεοῦ, Sim. Amorg. 7_{104}.

3. ειου.

εου < εοντ- is not contracted in the verb.

179. O + EI.

1. ορει uncontracted in μηνοειδής, ἀνθρωποειδής, Hdt.; τροχοειδής, Hdt., Theog. 7; ἰχθυοειδής, Hdt. VII, 61, is a different formation from ἰχθυώδης, VII, 109 (-ώδης out of εὐώδης?); ἀποειπών, Theog. 89. ο + spurious ει in -οεις in Σολόεις, etc.; also in ἀλοργοῦς, Samos 220_{27}, § 162.

2. οιει becomes οι in verbal forms: διδοῖ, Sim. Amorg. 7_{54}; Mimn. 2_{16}; μισθοῖς, etc., < ο + spurious ει perhaps in μισθοῦν; see § 162, 1 and 2.

180. O + OI.

οιοι = οι in μισθοῖμεν. οροι in ἀθρόοι, Hdt. III, 109; τοὶκ[ό]πεδον, Chios 174 D 18, in Bechtel; cf. Attic τῷκίδιον, *Clouds*, 92.

181. O + AY

in ωὐτός,[1] τωὐτό, ἐμεωυτοῦ < ἐμέο αὐτοῦ, σεωυτοῦ, ἑωυτοῦ, in Hdt., Hippokr., and their imitators. οι + αυ in ὡυτοί, II, 168; but οἱ αὐτοί, I, 182, VII, 168; sometimes even ἑωυτοί[2] appears. ου + αυ in τωὐτοῦ, Hdt. (Greg. Corinth. *d. d. I.* § 46), upon a single occasion, III, 72. Elsewhere τοῦ αὐτοῦ, V, 52, IX, 101. ου, it will be remembered, is not diphthongal here.

182. O + OY (spurious).

1. ορου. Ἱπποθόου, Chios 177_2; Πολύθρου, Teos 158_{27}; ζοοῦ, Archil. 63; νόου, Theog. 223; Arch. tetr. 56_5; περιρρόου, Hdt. I, 174; ἀντιξόους, VII, 150; but εὔνου, VI, 105 in Mss.

[1] Cf. ωὐτός, E 396. Greg. Corinth. p. 419, had the absurd notion that ωὐτός stood for αὐτός. Analogy went so far as to coin ἡ ὡυτή (*sic*), ἡ ὡυτή, τὰ ὡυτά, τὰ ἑωυτά, ἡ ἑωυτή in the text of Aretaios.

[2] ἐμαυτός in Pherekrates is a poor support to such a form.

Digitized by Google

2. οᾳου < οᾳοντ- = ου in μισθοῦσι, etc.

ο + ου = ου by crasis in τοὔνομα, Hdt. αι + ου in οὐροφύλακες, Roberts 149 A 15, 19.

183. H + AI.

ησαι = η in βούλη, Ionic-Attic.

184. H + EI

in ηρει, ἤειραν, Hdt. IX, 59, VI, 99 (conj. Mss. -ηραν); παρήειρε, Arch. 94.

185. H + AY.

δηῦτε, Archil. 60, Hippon. 78; ἡ αὐτή, Hdt. IV, 38, as τῇ αὐτῇ, never with crasis, despite ὠὐτός, τωὐτό. Aretaios' text offers ὠὐτή 52, and even ἡ ὠὐτή 158, and often.

186. Ω(I) + AY

in τωὐτῷ, Hdt., etc.

ABBREVIATIONS.

A. J. P. = American Journal of Philology.
A. P. A. = Transactions of the Amer. Philol. Assoc.
Allen, *Versification* = Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, vol. IV.
Astr. = Lukian περὶ τῆς Ἀστρονομίης.
Ἀθην. = Ἀθήναιον, σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν κατὰ διμηνίαν ἐκδιδόμενον, etc.
Bechtel = Die Inschriften des ionischen Dialekts.
Bennett = On the Sounds and Inflections of the Cyprian Dialect.
B. B. = Bezzenberger's Beiträge.
B. C. H. = Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique.
B. P. W. = Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift.
Bredow = *De dialecto Herodotea.*
C. D. I. = Collitz' Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften.
C. I. A. = Corpus inscriptionum Atticarum.
C. I. G. = Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum.
C. S. / Curt. Stud. } = Curtius' Studien.
d. d. I. = Greg. Corinthius' περὶ τῆς Ἰάδος διαλέκτου.
d. S. / d. d. S. } = Lukian περὶ τῆς Συρίης θεοῦ.
D. S. = Dittenberger's Sylloge.
D. V. C. = Johansson's *De derivatis verbis contractis linguae Graecae.*

Digitized by Google

Erman = *De titulorum ionicorum dialecto* in Curt. Stud. vol. V.
Et. Mag. = Etymologicum Magnum, ed. Sylburg.
Forsch. = Osthoff's Forschungen.
G. G. A. = Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.
Gött. Nachr. = Göttingen Nachrichten.
Hdn. π. μ. λ. / Herod. π. μ. λ. = Herodian περὶ μονήρους λέξεως.
H. E. V. A. = Hinrichs' *De Homericae elocutionis vestigiis Aeolicis.*
I. G. A. = Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum antiquissimarum.
J. H. S. = Journal of Hellenic Studies.
K. C. = King and Cookson's Principles of Sound and Inflexion.
Klein *Vasen* = Die griechischen Vasen mit Meistersignaturen (2d ed.).
K. Z. = Kuhn's Zeitschrift.
L. = The united testimony of the Mss. of Herodotos.
L. S. = Liddell & Scott's Lexicon.
Lindemann = Lindemann *De dialecto Ionica recentiore.*
Meist. / Meisterhans = Grammatik der attischen Inschriften, 2nd ed.
Meister / G. D. = Meister's Griechische Dialekte, vols. I and II.
Mém. = Saussure's Mémoire sur le systéme primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes.
Menrad = *De contractionis et synizeseos usu Homerico.*
Mitth. = Mittheilungen des deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts zu Athen.
Μουσ. καὶ βιβλ. = Μουσεῖον καὶ βιβλιοθήκη τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς σχολῆς of Smyrna.
M. U. = Morphologische Untersuchungen.
Num. Chron. = Numismatic Chronicle.
Renner = *De dialecto antiquioris Graecorum poesis elegiacae et iambicae* in Curt. Stud. vol. I.
Roehl = I. G. A.
Rob. / Roberts = Introduction to Greek Epigraphy; Part I.
R. M. = Rheinisches Museum.
Sterrett = Papers of the Am. School of Classical Studies at Athens, vols. II and III.
Stud. = Curtius' *Studien.*
Th. (L.) / Thas. (L.) = Bechtel's Thasische Inschriften ionischen Dialekts im Louvre.
unc. loc. = uncertain locality.
V. H. D. = Fritsch's Zum Vokalismus des herodotischen Dialekts.
W. F. = Wescher-Foucart: Inscriptions recueillies à Delphes.

Arrian is quoted from the text of Hercher-Eberhard.
Eusebius is quoted from the text of Müller's Frag. Hist. Graec.
Eusebius Myndius is quoted from the text of Mullach.
Lukian is quoted from the text of Jacobitz.
Aretaios is quoted from the text of Kühn.
Hippokrates is quoted from the paragraphs of Ermerins. Littré's text has been compared.

Digitized by Google

E I = περὶ ἐπιδημιῶν τὸ πρῶτον.
E III = περὶ ἐπιδημιῶν τὸ τρίτον.
Π = Προγνωστικόν.
ΠΑ = περὶ ἀέρων ὑδάτων τόπων.
ΠΔΟ = περὶ διαίτης ὀξέων.
ΠΤΚ = περὶ τῶν ἐν κεφαλῇ τραυμάτων.
ΠΚ = προγνώσεις Κωακαί.

The pseudo-Ionic letters are cited from Hercher-Boissonade.

For the study of later Ionism Lukian's *Astronomy* has been regarded as equally genuine with the *Syrian Goddess* (see Allinson A. J. P. VII, 203 ff.).

All Ionic inscriptions are quoted from the numbers of Bechtel's collection; all other dialect inscriptions are cited by the numbering of C. D. I., except when another source is specially stated. The date of an inscription is frequently indicated by a Roman numeral followed by the letter C, *e.g.* (V C) = fifth century.

Wackernagel's *Dehnungsgesetz* and Johannes Schmidt's *Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra* were not received until the printing of the above article had so far advanced that it was impossible to take cognizance of the views advocated therein. A few references have, however, been inserted. The second edition of Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik* reached me too late to permit any but a sporadic notice of modifications of views maintained in the first edition and referred to in the course of this paper.

I desire to express my thanks to my colleague, Professor Collitz, for his courtesy in looking over the proof-sheets of this paper.

Digitized by Google

II.—*A New Source in Plutarch's Life of Cicero.*

By Dr. A. GUDEMAN,

NEW YORK.

Two modes of philological investigations have of recent years risen into high favor. The one, which may be termed the *statistical* method, consists in carefully and minutely examining the style of some Greek or Roman author, usually with a view to determine the chronology of his works or to settle questions regarding their authenticity. Dealing only with documentary evidence, this method proceeds on perfectly safe lines, the only danger which it constantly incurs being a kind of irresistible tendency to sweeping inferences, based upon coincidences often, indeed, remarkable.[1] The other method, that of "*Source Researches*," rests on no such firm foundation, the *loss* of the *original* sources being, in fact, the *conditio sine qua non* of its existence. The question with which this paper is concerned belongs to this latter category of philological inquiry and is more immediately confined to Plutarch's *Life of Cicero.*

I need hardly expatiate upon the great difficulties necessarily involved in researches of this nature, a fact made emphatically apparent by the utter lack of unanimity so frequently displayed by scholars, in the conclusions at which they have arrived. The intrinsic difficulty of the subject and an ever-present element of uncertainty, are, however, I conceive, not the only reasons for this deplorable state of affairs. It is also due, in no small measure, to the undeniable fact that philologists too often enter upon their task with preconceived opinions and without having previously ascertained their author's method and style of work by a diligent perusal of his writings, a demand perhaps never so frequently disregarded as in the case of Plutarch.

He was a most voracious reader, with a keen, absorbing interest

[1] Cf. *eg. Dittenberger* (Hermes, XVI. p. 321 sqq.), *Schanz* (Hermes, XXI. 439 sqq.), *Ritter*, Untersuchungen über Plato, Stuttgart, Kohlmann, 1888; *Hussey*, On the Verbs of Saying in Plato, Proceed. of Am. Ph. Ass. 1889; *Roquette De Xenophontis vita*, Diss. Regimont, 1884. See also *Zeller's* criticisms, Arch. f. Gesch. d. Philos. II. p. 665, 676 sqq.

Digitized by Google

in every branch of human knowledge; and it was his habit to take notes of what he read or heard, either with a view to the composition of some particular treatise, or perhaps merely for the sake of future reference and use. His erudition is encyclopaedic, and in his works he would draw freely upon this vast thesaurus of fact and anecdote, marshalling them into literary phalanxes, as would best suit his purpose.

But, while the characteristics and typical traits in Plutarch's biographical writings are the direct result of his literary skill and his historical method,[2] influenced though they were by the limitations imposed upon him by nature, we can properly estimate the *value* of his biographies only by the authenticity of the sources consulted. Where these were few, he naturally followed the one that appeared to him the more copious and best adapted to his purpose. If, however, the material at his disposal was as superabundant as was unquestionably the case in the Life of Cicero, he had to exercise his faculty of criticism and discrimination to no small extent if he desired, as he professedly did,[3] to give an *impartial* and *truthful* picture of his hero. To ascertain how near Plutarch came to realizing this cherished aim, unbiassed investigations into the sources whence he drew his information are absolutely necessary. The mere assumption of some one particular source, because of real or alleged coincidences between it and Plutarch's narrative, is quite gratuitous and unwarranted as long as the *probability* of some intermediate source remains, for Plutarch did not at all times have access to the *original* sources for the information which he imparts. He may well have taken, and in innumerable instances demonstrably did take, his facts *at second hand*, which does not, however, necessarily render the testimony given either worthless or even less in value, unless demonstrated to be so on other grounds. A quotation, therefore, from some author now lost, or a striking coincidence with some work still extant, does not necessarily imply that the writer had the original, from which the words are taken, before his eyes.

To determine this, we must, in the first place, carefully inquire in each and every instance, whether other passages in Plutarch will warrant us in ascribing to him a *personal* knowledge of the particular

[2] Alex. 1 sqq. (*οὔτε γὰρ ἱστορίας γράφομεν ἀλλὰ βίους*, etc.); Pericl. 1, 7, 13; Timol. c. 1; Cato Mai. c. 7; Galba 2; Fab. Max. 16; Pomp. 8; Artaxerxes c. 8; Nicias 1; Arat. 1; Demet. 1.

[3] Thes. 1; Cimon. 2; Cat. Min. 37; de Herod. malig. c. 5; de gloria Athen. c. 3.

Digitized by Google

work under discussion. If so, the further question arises, whether the two apparently similar accounts do not harbor discrepancies and differences of a nature that would make it impossible for us to believe that a writer, possessing the unquestioned ability of a Plutarch, can possibly have made use of certain portions of his "Quelle" and then suddenly have had recourse to some other authority, while completely overlooking or purposely ignoring an entirely different, though perhaps equally truthful version in the author just abandoned by him. I may explain my meaning by an example. In Plut. *Cic.* VI. 15 sq. *'S.* we read the following:

Ἐπὶ τούτοις οὖν μέγα φρονῶν εἰς Ῥώμην βαδίζων γελοῖον τι παθεῖν φησι. Συντυχὼν γὰρ ἀνδρὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν φίλῳ δοκοῦντι περὶ Καμπανίαν, ἐρέσθαι, τίνα δὴ τῶν πεπραγμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λόγον ἔχουσι Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ τί φρονοῦσιν ὡς ὀνόματος καὶ δόξης τῶν πεπραγμένων αὐτῷ τὴν πόλιν ἅπασαν ἐμπεπληκώς τὸν δ' εἰπεῖν· "Ποῦ γὰρ ᾖς, ὦ Κικέρων, τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον"; τότε μὲν οὖν ἐξαθυμῆσαι παντάπασιν, εἰ καθάπερ εἰς πέλαγος ἀχανὲς τὴν πόλιν ἐμπεσὼν ὁ περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγος οὐδὲν εἰς δόξαν ἐπίδηλον πεποίηκεν κ.τ.λ.

As this anecdote is not found elsewhere, except in *Cicero's* speech *pro Plancio* (26, 63 sqq.), this oration has always been looked upon as the source of Plutarch. This assumption is, however, altogether erroneous, as will be readily admitted on comparing the passage just quoted with the original:

"Vere me hercule hoc dicam: sic tum existimabam nihil homines aliud Romae nisi de quaestura mea loqui; excogitati quidam erant a Siculis honores in me inauditi, itaque hac spe decedebam ut mihi populum Romanum ultro omnia delaturum putarem. At ego cum casu diebus iis itineris faciendi causa decedens e provincia Puteolos forte venissem, concidi paene, iudices, cum ex me quidam quaesisset quo die Romae exissem et num quidnam novi. Cui cum respondissem me e provincia decedere, 'Etiam, me hercule,' inquit, 'ut opinor ex Africa.' Huic ego iam stomachans fastidiose 'Immo ex Sicilia' inquam. Tum quidam quasi qui omnia sciret, 'Quid? tu nescis hunc quaestorem Syracusis (!) fuisse.'"

Now Plutarch was, as is well known, a passionate lover of anecdote, nor could any one tell a good story more delightfully than he; and yet we are asked to believe that this clumsy and pointless account, differing also in *essential* details from the original, is the direct reproduction of the exquisitely well-told story just quoted from Cicero! But if Plutarch can never have read this anecdote in Cicero himself, it certainly is no rash inference to maintain that he in all likelihood never read a line of this speech, let the alleged coincidences between

Digitized by Google

it and certain parts of the Greek narrative be what they will. The same may be predicated of the orations against Catiline which are generally supposed to have been known to Plutarch. Such similarity, however, as apparently exists between the two accounts, is in no sense surprising, rather perfectly natural, as it almost necessarily arises from both authors treating one and the same well-known historical occurrence. By a similar process of reasoning which seems never to have been resorted to before, we are enabled to eliminate a number of other writings of Cicero commonly supposed to have been known to the Greek biographer.

In the discussion of Plutarch's *Roman* Lives still another problem presents itself, which must at least be touched upon before we can enter upon the more immediate object of this paper. The question is simply this: Are we justified in attributing to Plutarch a sufficient knowledge of Latin that would have enabled him to read the innumerable authors whom he *expressly quotes?*[4]

[4] *C. Acilius*, Rom. 21; *M. Porcius Cato*, Cato Maior (17 times), Comp. Arist. et Cat. 5, Quaest. Rom. 49; *L. Capurnius Piso*, Numa 21; *C. Fannius*, Tib. Gracch. 4; *Sempronius Tuditanus*, T. Flam. 14; *Scipio Nasica*, Aem. 15. 21; *C. Gracchus*, Tib. Gracch. 8; *Rutilius Rufus*, Mar. 28, Pomp. 37; *Q. Lutatius Catulus*, Marius 25 sq.; *Claudius* (Quadrigarius?), Numa 1 (*ἐν ἐλέγχῳ χρόνων*); *Valerias Antias*, Rom. 14, Numa 22, Flam. 18, de fort. Rom. 10; *Sallustius*, Lucull. 11. 33; comp. Lys. et Sullae 3. *Cicero — Letters: Pomp.* 62 (= ad Att. I. 12, 3, cf. also ad fam. V. 2. 6); *Cic.* 24 (de Dem. ad Herodem et ad filium, de Gorgia ad filium et altera ad Pelopem Byzantium, cf. ad fam. XII. 16. 2; XVI. 21. 6); *Cic.* 35 (ad Caelium, cf. ad Att. XIV. 5. 1; ad fam. II. 11); c. 36 (= ad Att. VIII. 7. 2), c. 40, Praecept. ger. rep. 27 (= ad fam. IV. 13); *Cic.* c. 37 (sed cf. ad Att. VII. 17. 3). *Orations:* Crass. 13; Caes. 4; Cic. 24 (Philippics, cf. also c. 48, Ant. 6. 9); c. 35 (pro Murena, cf. also Cato 21; comp. Dem. et Cic. 1); comp. Dem. et Cic. 1 (pro Caelio); Cic. 37 (pro Ligario), cf. c. 10–23 orations against Catilina. *Other works:* Aem. c. 10 (= de divin. I. 46, 103; II. 40, 83); Cato Maior 17; Flam. 18 (= de senect. 12, 42); Lucull. 42 (Academica); Crass. 13 (*περὶ ὑπατείας*); Caes. 3, 54; Cic. 39 (laudatio Catonis); Cic. c. 40 (philosophical works). Cf. also Phoc. 3; C. Gracch. 1 (= de div. I. 56); Cato Min. c. 50; Cic. 2; comp. Dem. et Cic. 2 (cedant arma togae, etc.). *Tiro*, Cic. 41, 49. *Nepos*, comp. Pel. et Marc. 1; Marc. 12, 30; Tib. Gracch. 21; Luc. 43. *Brutus*, Cic. 44, 45; Brut. (13 times). *Caesar*, comp. Pel. et Marc. 1; Pomp. 63; Caes. 2, 3, 22, 54; Cato Min. 46, 52, 54; Cic. 39. *Asinius Pollio*, Caes. 46; Pomp. 72. *Sulpicius Galba*, Rom. 17. *Tanusius Geminus*, Caes. 22. *Calpurnius Bibulus*, Brut. 2, 13, 23. *Volumnius*, Brut. 48, 51. *Munatius Rufus*, Cato Min. 25, 36, 37. *Livius*, Cam. 5 (cf. Livy V. 21); Marc. 11, 30 (lib. XXVII. 27); comp. Marc. 1 (lib. XXVII. 2, 12); Flamin. 18; Cato Maior 17 (lib. XXXIX. 42); Flamin. 19 (lib. XXXIX. 51); Sulla 6 (ex lib. LXXVII. deperdito); Lucull. 28, 31 (ex lib. LXXXXVIII. dep.); Caes. 47 (ex lib. CXI. dep.), 63 (ex lib. CXVI. dep.); Q. R.

Digitized by Google

On the strength of a famous chapter in the life of Demosthenes (c. 2), it has been answered in various ways. We are there told that he did not begin the study of Latin till late in life, and that he acquired a knowledge of the language by a method most unique and quite incredible, for "it was not so much by the knowledge of words that I came to the understanding of things, but by my experience of things, I was enabled to follow the meaning of words . . . and so in this *fifth* book of my Parallel Lives, in giving an account of Dem. and Cicero, my comparisons of their natural dispositions and their characters will be formed upon their actions and lives as statesmen, and I shall not pretend to criticise their orations one against the other, to show which of the two was the more charming or the more powerful speaker. . . ."

If I rightly interpret this interesting passage, Plutarch does not wish to be understood as saying that he was unable to read Latin intelligently, for he distinctly implies the contrary; but he simply tells us in his modest way that he did not sufficiently master the language of the Romans to constitute him a competent critic of the respective merits of Dem. and Cicero as *orators*, and I am persuaded that every reader will rise from the perusal of his works with the very strong impression that Plutarch certainly possessed a very fair acquaintance with Latin prose writings. But while this must be admitted, it will be seen that the real problem is not whether Plutarch could read Latin authors, *for such sources as he did consult in his Roman biographies were in any case written in that language*,[5] but whether the information which he imparts was taken *directly* from the writers whom he expressly cites as his authorities, or if not quoted by name, as is but too often the case, may be reasonably supposed to point to some one particular work possibly accessible to him. The case of Plutarch's alleged indebtedness to Livy is a good instance. His name occurs some *fourteen* times in Plutarch, the quotations extending from *book V. to book CXVI.*, not counting a number of

25; de fort. Rom. 13 (Livy V. 37 sqq.). *Varro*, Q. R. 2, 4, 5, 14, 27, 90, 101, 105; Romul. 16. *C. Oppius*, Pomp. 10; Caes. 17. *Q. Dellius*, Ant. 59. *Corvinus*, Brut. 40, 42, 45. *C. Drusus*, Tib. Gracch. 2. *Fenestella*, Q. R. 41; Crass. 4; Sylla 28 [*P. Thrasea Paetus ex Munatio*, Cato 25, 36]. *Cluvius Rufus*, Q. R. 107; Otho 3. *Iul Secundus*, Otho 9. *Augustus*, comp. Dem. et Cic. 3; Cic. 45; Brut. 27, 41; Ant. 22, 68. *Valerius Maximus*, Marc. 12 (= V. 6); Brut. 53 (= IV. 6. 5 K.); [Γαῖος τις πείσων, ἀνὴρ ἱστορικὸς] Mar. 35. *Empulus*, Brut. 2.

[5] Barring a few exceptions, such as the memoirs of Lucullus and of Sulla, and Cicero's ὑπόμνημα τῆς ὑπατείας, which were all written in Greek.

Digitized by Google

coincidences with this history, where Livy is not especially cited. I do not see how the apparently exhaustive knowledge of Livy here displayed can be accounted for except on the supposition that Plutarch actually read, to use the words of Martial (XIV. 190), "Livius ingens, quem mea non totum bibliotheca capit"! But as this is an intrinsic improbability, and in as much as there is no evidence of an epitome of Livy existing in Plutarch's time, to which all his quotations might in that case be easily referred, we are forced to the conclusion that Livy was solely known to the Greek historian through the medium of other works which he consulted.[6] But if this is the conclusion which an unprejudiced inquiry must lead to, on the face of Livian passages yet *extant*, the temerity of the attempt so constantly made to establish *without the aid of strong collateral evidence*, an interdependence between Plutarch and such of Livy's books as are now unfortunately *lost*, will be plainly apparent.

Again, to take the case of *Cicero*, we contend, that there is scarcely a passage quoted by Plutarch from this writer of a nature to necessitate the assumption of direct indebtedness, for nearly all of these references are either too vague or too general, if not actually contradictory, or the discrepancies too far counterbalance apparent coincidences, to be compatible with a personal acquaintance on Plutarch's part with the works apparently referred to. And then, does it not stand to reason that the biographer, when he had determined to write up the great orator's life, would not, like a modern Drumann, have gone through the voluminous works of Cicero for his materials, even though every single work of his, thanks to the egregious vanity of the man,[7] fairly teems with autobiographical detail.

Of the orator's writings which were professedly autobiographical, the titles of five have come down to us, the ὑπόμνημα τῆς ὑπατείας (*ad Att.* I. 19, 10; I. 20, 6; II. 1, 1; Plut. *Caes.* 8; *Crass.* 13; Cassius Dio 46, 21), the *same* in Latin prose (*ad Att.* l.c.; cf. also Schol. *Bob.* p. 270, Or.; "epistula ad Pompeium non mediocris ad instar voluminis scripta"), *a poem de consulatu*, in three books

[6] This inference is confirmed by a comparison of the passages themselves. Thus, Plut. Cam. 5 sq. cannot well have been taken *directly* from Livy, notwithstanding the very direct reference found in our texts (Λιόυιος or Λίβιος δέ φησι). Cf. also Plut. Marc. 30 with Livy XXVII. 28 (Λίβιος) and many others.

[7] What the poet Horace, in a famous passage (Sat. II. 1, 35), said of Lucilius applies with equal force to Cicero: "qui velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim credebat libris . . . quo fit ut omnis votiva pateat veluti descripta tabella vita senis."

Digitized by Google

(Urania, Minerva, Calliope),[8] *a poem de temporibus suis* (*ad Quintum fratrem* III. 1, 24; III. 9), and finally a work usually designated as *De consiliis suis* (cf. Asc. *Ped.* p. 831 Or.; Cassius Dio 39, 10 and perhaps alluded to in Plut. *Crass.* 13, ἐν τινι λόγῳ . . . οὗτος μὲν ὁ λόγος ἐξεδόθη μετὰ τὴν ἀμφοῖν [Crassus and Caesar] τελευτήν. Charisius *G. L.* I. 146; Boeth. *de inst. mus.* I. 1. Identical with the Ἀνέκδοτα so frequently mentioned in Cic. letters to Atticus II. 6, 2; XIV. 14, 5, etc.).

The four last were unquestionably not consulted by Plutarch; the first has, however, been generally regarded as the principal source of the narrative of Catiline's conspiracy (ch. 10–23). It is not the object of this paper to enter upon a discussion of this question, about which quite a literature has already clustered,[9] nor am I disposed to deny that the Greek account may be based upon Cicero's ὑπόμνημα, but this concession does not necessarily involve the further admission of Plutarch's *direct* indebtedness, for the identical chapters of the ὑπόμνημα may well have been reproduced in Tiro's[10] exhaustive biography of his patron and friend, a work generally conceded to have constituted one of Plutarch's principal authorities; and yet we are expected to believe that the moment he had reached this part of his narrative, he suddenly abandoned his author, taking recourse to the identical fountain whence Tiro himself drew all his information!

[8] A few fragments still remain; cf. de div. I. 17–22. Two verses in this poem have gained considerable notoriety, owing to the frequent attacks made against them. *Cedant arma togae*, etc. (Quint. IX. 4, 41; Plut. Comp. Cic. 2; also quoted by Cic. de off. I. 22, 77, in Pis. 30, and o fortunatam natam me consule Roman, cf. Iuv. X. 124).

[9] *Heeren*, de fontibus, etc., Plutarchi, 1840, p. 133 sqq. *I. G. Lagus*, Plutarchus vitae Ciceronis scriptor, II. p. 71 sqq., Helsingfors, 1846. *Sibinga*, De Plut. in vita Cic. fontibus, etc., Diss. Leyden, 1863 (pp. 47–143). *Weizsäcker*, Iahrb. f. Phil. 111, p. 417 sqq. *Besser*, De coniurationes Catilin, Diss. Leipzig, 1880. *E. Schmidt*, De Cic. commentaris . . . a Plut. in vita Cic. expresso Lübeck (Diss. Iena) 1884. *Thouret*, De Cicerone, Asinio Pollione, etc., Diss. Leipzig, 1878 (= Leipz. Stud. I. 313 sqq.). *K. Buresch*, Comment. philol. in honorem Ribbeckii, Teubner, 1888, p. 219 sqq.

[10] A phrase in Plut. Cic. c. 14, 10 s. seems, indeed, to point to a *Latin* source, for we there read 'πραγμάτων καινῶν ἐφιεμένους.' But this is an evident translation of the well-known Latin idiom, 'rebus novis studere.' There is *no parallel Greek* passage, for the νεωτέρων πραγμάτων ἐπιθυμεῖν (ποιεῖν) to be found in Her. Lys. Thucyd. Isocr. is in no way analogous, though perhaps identical in thought, for the invariable use of the *comparative* constitutes the very essential difference between the two expressions. That the ὑπόμνημα of Cicero is not responsible for this Latinism is shown by Ep. ad Att. I. 19, 10.

Digitized by Google

These introductory remarks concerning the methodical lines, upon which source inquiries must proceed, if the results attained are to possess any validity at all, were deemed necessary (a fact which may possibly excuse their prolixity) for our present purpose. The tendency to rash inferences is the ever-present danger which can only be avoided by our approaching the subject "sine ira et studio," and by not allowing the "wish to be father to the thought." Our conclusions must be the outcome of cogent argumentation; and if the fragmentary state of our knowledge should at any point not yield any satisfactory results, if we can only, in the words of Cicero, "rivulos sectari fontes rerum non videre," then let us frankly say so, and not cover the weakness of our position (to wit, a recent paper on Plutarch's Cicero) by apodictic assertions and a profuse display of rhetorical pyrotechnics.

We have observed that Plutarch's acquaintance with Cicero's writings was probably not so extensive as some scholars would have us believe. But even if this were not so, it would still be perfectly self-evident, from the *vita* before us, that the great orator's works did not constitute Plutarch's only source of information. I do not propose to enter upon the treatment of these sources here,[11] but shall confine myself, for purposes of brevity no less than for the sake of clearness, to those portions of the Greek biography which deal with the personal and literary side of Cicero, as distinct from the political. I shall, therefore, not discuss Plutarch's alleged indebtedness to Livy, Sallust, or Asinius Pollio; for these writers, from the very nature of their histories, confined themselves to a more or less exhaustive narrative of Cicero's political activity, purely biographical detail being wholly beside the object they had in view. Nor, again, shall I inquire into the sources of Plutarch's account of the *death* of Cicero. For this tragic episode, appealing as it did so strongly to the minds of men, was very frequently depicted by historians and often chosen as a theme of discussion by rhetoricians.[12] The accounts possibly accessible to Plutarch were, consequently, so numerous that any attempt to determine his *fons primarius*, at least in the present fragmentary state of our knowledge, will necessarily be doomed to failure at the very outset.

Of the *monographical* literature on Cicero, so far as known to us,

[11] The author of this paper will shortly publish a critical edition of the Lives of Dem. and Cic., with a complete '*source commentary*.'

[12] Cf. the famous VII. Suasoria of the elder Seneca.

Digitized by Google

which carefully recorded all purely biographical details, while in no way neglecting his political history, scholars have been well-nigh unanimous in assuming Tiro's *Life of Cicero*[13] as constituting one of the chief sources of Plutarch. This biography was unquestionably of the very greatest authenticity, for not only was this life-long friend of the orator and the editor of his priceless correspondence in possession of absolutely all available material (cf. Gellius VI. (VII.) 3, 8), but he was also enabled to record many incidents derived from their original fountain, the living lips of Cicero himself, as is again attested by a passage in Gellius IV. 10, 5; cf. also XV. 6, 2.

There existed yet another biography of Cicero by a contemporary writer, which, strange to say, has never even been suggested as a possible source of Plutarch. I refer to the *vita Ciceronis* by *Cornelius Nepos*, a work which, if extant, cannot but have proved of the very greatest interest and value, for as the friend of Cicero and Pomponius Atticus, and himself possessed of a very profound knowledge of Roman history, he must have enjoyed most exceptional advantages and facilities for this task. For the solitary mention of this book, we are indebted to the following passage in Gellius *N. A.* XV. 28, 1, which must be quoted in full, as it will engage our attention again:

"Cornelius Nepos et rerum memoriae non indiligens et M. Ciceronis *ut qui maxime amicus familiaris* fuit. Atque is tamen in *librorum primo* quos de vita illius composuit errasse videtur cum eum scripsit tres et viginti annos natum primum causam iudicii publici egisse Sextumque Roscium parricidii reum defendisse. In qua re etiam *Fenestellam*[14] erasse Pedianus Asconius (no doubt in his

[13] This work is mentioned twice by Plutarch himself (ch. 41, 49), also by *Tacitus*, Dial. 17, and Gellius IV. 10. 5; and from *Asconius Pedianus* in Milon, p. 49, Or., we glean the additional information that in his *fourth* book Tyro had not yet advanced beyond the Clodian episode! This same writer was also the *reputed* author of a book, *de iocis Ciceronis*, to which Plutarch was possibly indebted for the numerous 'bon-mots' of the orator found in the *vita* (cf. *Quint.* VI. 3, 5, "utinam Tiro libertus eius aut *aliquis quisquis fuit qui tres hac de re libros edidit*, parcius dictorum numero indulsisset." Again, *Quint.* VIII. 6, 73, Ciceronis est in quodam ioculari libello). Also quoted, but as a genuine work, by *Macrob.* Saturn. II. 1, 12, and *Schol. Bob.* in Sest. p. 309, Or. Another collection of Cicero's "facete dicta" was made by *C. Trebonius*, cf. Cic. ad fam. 15, 21, 1 sqq.

[14] We know next to nothing of the works of this accurate writer (according to Hieronymus, he died 19 A.D., a septuagenarian. Cf. Teuffel, R. L. § 259). From the passages from Asconius, however, quoted by Gellius, and from four others still extant (in Pis. p. 1, in Mil. p. 32, in tog. cand. p. 85, 86), I should infer that F. had given a complete *chronological table* of Cicero's writings (in the "Annales"?), perhaps with short exegetical notes; cf. Asconius in Pis. p. 5, Or.

Digitized by Google

lost commentary to that oration) animadvertit quod eum scripserit sexto vicesimo aetatis anno pro Sextio Roscio dixisse. Longior autem Nepotis quam Fenestellae error est nisi quis vult in animum inducere Nepotem *studio amoris et amicitiae adductum amplificandae admirationis gratia* quadriennium suppressisse ut M. Cicero orationem florentissimam dixisse pro Roscio admodum adulescens videretur."

This accusation of partiality was probably occasioned by the apologetic and eulogistic character of Nepos' narrative, a supposition confirmed by a fragment preserved in the so-called codex Gudianus 278 (Peter, *Fragm. hist. Rom.*, p. 223).[15]

It will have been observed that all the authors that have hitherto been thought of as possible sources of Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* were either contemporary with the orator or very nearly so. It seems not to have occurred to any one that there are passages in this very Life that clearly and unmistakably point to a later origin, passages that can never have emanated from *Tiro* or *Nepos* or any other contemporary writer possibly accessible to the Greek biographer; or, in other words, it can be shown that Plutarch also consulted some one or more *post-Augustan* authorities. Having shown this to be true, beyond possible refutation, we shall proceed to prove that one of these sources, if, indeed, there were more, was no other than *Suetonius Tranquillus* in his *vita Ciceronis*, which formed, as is well known, a part of his famous work, *De viris illustribus*.

In order, then, to prove the *first* proposition, that *among the sources of Plutarch's Cicero there was also a post-Augustan writer*, we take the closing paragraph of ch. 2, which reads as follows:

"καὶ τι καὶ ποιημάτιον ἔτι παιδὸς αὐτοῦ διασώζεται Πόντιος Γλαῦκος, ἐν τετραμέτρῳ πεποιημένον. Προιὼν δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ ποικιλώτερον ἅπτομενος τῆς περὶ ταῦτα μούσης ἔδοξεν οὐ μόνον ῥήτωρ ἀλλὰ καὶ ποιητὴς ἄριστος εἶναι Ῥωμαίων. Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τῇ ῥητορικῇ δόξα μέχρι νῦν διαμένει καίπερ οὐ μικρᾶς γεγενημένης περὶ τοὺς λόγους καινοτομίας, τὴν δὲ ποιητικὴν αὐτοῦ, πολλῶν εὐφυῶν ἐπιγενομένων παντάπασιν ἀκλεῆ καὶ ἄτιμον ἔρρειν συμβέβηκεν."

[15] "Cornelius Nepos in libro de historicis Latinis de laude Ciceronis: non ignorare debes, unum hoc genus Latinarum litterarum adhuc non modo non respondere Graeciae sed omnino rude atque inchoatum morte Ciceronis relictum. Ille enim fuit unus, qui potuerit et etiam debuerit historiam digna voce pronuntiare, quippe qui oratoriam eloquentiam rudem a maioribus acceptam perpoliverit, philosophiam ante eum incomptam Latinam sua conformavit oratione (cf. Plut. Cic. 40). ex quo dubito interitu eius utrum res publica an historia magis doleat." — "Locuples ac divina natura quo maiorem sui pareret admirationem ponderatiora-

Digitized by Google

That this piece of literary criticism is not the intellectual property of the biographer, as far as its essential details are concerned, will not, I am persuaded, be seriously denied by any student of Plutarch. He was at best but an indifferent judge, even of Greek verse, and of Roman poetry he does not seem to have even the slightest acquaintance, no mention being made by him of any Latin poet, throughout all the voluminous writings that have come down to us.[16]

But if this criticism is not Plutarch's own, it can only be attributed to some other *post-Augustan* author for the following reasons: In the first place, we draw attention to the words *μέχρι νῦν διαμένει* and *ἔτι διασώζεται*, which clearly indicate some contemporary source consulted by the biographer. In the second place, the very contents of the passage under notice bear strong internal evidence of its post-Augustan origin, for the highly unfavorable verdict which is here passed upon the poetry of Cicero did not begin to be accepted till the second

que sua essent beneficia, neque uni omnia dare nec rursus cuiquam omnia voluit negare."

[16] This may seem a rash statement to make in the face of the well-known mention of *Horace* in *Lucull.* ch. 39. This passage, however, is a most palpable interpolation; so palpable, in fact, that I am astounded at its never having been taken for such before. A juxtaposition of both passages will make this clear:

	Hor. Epist. I. 6, 40 *sqq.*
Στρατηγοῦ δέ ποτε φιλοτιμουμένου περί θέας καὶ χόρῳ τινι κόσμον αἰτιουμένου πορφυρᾶς χλαμύδας ἀπεκρίνατο σκεφάμενος ἂν ἔχῃ, δώσειν, εἶτα μεθ' ἡμέραν ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁπόσων δέοιτο, τοῦ δὲ ἑκατον ἀρκέσειν φήσαντος, ἐκέλευσε λαβεῖν δὶς τοσαύτας, εἰς ὃ καὶ Φλάκκος ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπιπεφώνηκεν ὡς οὐ νομίζει πλοῦτον οὗ μὴ τὰ παρορώμενα καὶ λανθάνοντα πλείονα τῶν φαινομένων ἐστί.	chlamydas, Lucullus, ut aiunt si posset centum scaenae praebere rogatus 'qui possum tot?' ait, tamen et quaero et quot habebo, mittam? post paulo *scribit* sibi *milia quinque.* esse domi chlamydum, *partem vel tolleret omnis.* exilis domus est ubi non et multa supersunt et dominum fallunt et prosunt furibus.

The two versions are widely different, that of Plutarch containing a number of details that could not possibly have been suggested by the passage in Horace, and the "*ἐπιφώνημα*" can only be made to correspond with the moral which the Latin poet gives to the story by the most liberal kind of interpretation. It is, moreover, very awkwardly and quite unexpectedly joined to the preceding. The anecdote is complete without it, as it is not given by Plutarch with any didactive purpose, as in the case of Horace. The words "*εἰς . . . ἐστί*" simply represent the marginal gloss of some ancient reader, which subsequently crept into the text.

Digitized by Google

half of the first century of our era, as will be seen from the following passages:

Seneca enc. controv. 3, *praef.* 8: Ciceronem eloquentia sua in carminibus destituit. *Seneca de ira* III. 37, 5: et Cicero si derideres carmina eius inimicus esset. Cf. also Gell. N. A. XII. 2 (Seneca frag. 111, H.). *Tacitus* Dial. 21: fecerunt enim et carmina et in bibliothecas retulerunt non melius quam Cicero sed felicius quia illos fecisse pauciores sciunt. *Quintil.* XI. 1, 24: in carminibus utinam pepercisset quae non desierunt carpere maligni. *Martial* II. 89, 3: Carmina quod scribis Musis et Apolline nullo | Laudari debes. Hoc Ciceronis habes. *Iuvenal* X. 124: ridenda poemata. Cf. also vs. 122. *Schol. Bob.*, p. 306 *Or.*[17]: Manifestum est amatorem poeticae rei Tullium fuisse quamvis ad oratoriam qua maxime praestitit non videatur in versibus par sui fuisse.

Now all these authors are not only post-Augustan, but practically contemporary. There is no instance of an earlier writer who spoke thus disparagingly of Cicero's poetical productions. This fact cannot be accidental. Again, we may safely assert that neither Nepos, nor Tiro, nor Varro would have handed down to posterity any such verdict, even if convinced of its truth. The only other author to whom we might be disposed to attribute a similar criticism is the impartial *Fenestella* († 19 A.D.); but unfortunately, even if this were not a mere supposition, there is not the slightest evidence or probability of any kind that Plutarch ever read any of his works, although he quotes him three times (cf. note 2).

Plutarch's indebtedness to some post-Augustan author having been thus demonstrated, we may now, resting on this firm foundation, proceed to show that Suetonius' *vita Ciceronis* constituted one of these sources.

To accomplish this object, we must briefly discuss the sources of *Hieronymus* and *Sextus Aurelius Victor.*

The former of these need not occupy us very long, for if there is one thing recognized by scholars as an irrefutable fact, it is, that the items concerning Roman literature, found in Hieronymus'[18] additions to the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, are, up to a certain date, all taken from *Suetonius Tranquillus, De viris illustribus.*

[17] This scholiast, although a Christian of the fifth century, is here quoted, because he very largely *Asconii* "fontibus hortulos suos irrigavit." Cf. *Madwig,* De Q. Asconio Pediano, etc. Kopenhagen, 1828, p. 142.

[18] Cf. his own preface, p. 3 Sch., and *Mommsen,* Quellen der Chronik des H. Abh. der sachs Ges. d. W. 1850 (I. p. 669 sqq.). For his historical notices, H. is chiefly indebted to Eutropius, whose principal source was Livy.

Digitized by Google

Under the name of *Sextus Aurelius Victor* (an historian living in the time of Theodosius about the middle of the fourth century) there have come down to us, among other writings, two works entitled *Caesares* and *De viris illustribus.*[19] Without attaching too much importance to the *singular* coincidence in the titles of these works with those of *Suetonius*, which is in itself suggestive of interdependence, it may be sufficient to draw attention to the fact that the author of the *Caesares* demonstrably did draw very freely upon the *Caesares* of his great predecessor. The presumption, therefore, is that the *De viris illustribus* of Suetonius was also well known to Victor. But whatever may have been the sources of the *De viris illustribus*, a question which could not be discussed in this place without far transgressing the limits imposed upon this paper, I contend, that, at least, as far as the life of Cicero is concerned (which constitutes chap. 81 of his work), he is resting upon the shoulders of Suetonius' *vita Ciceronis*. For not only is there a remarkable family likeness between chap. 81[20] and the lives of some of the Roman poets that have been justly attributed to Suetonius, however diluted they may have been by subsequent accretions, but also because of certain parallelisms between Victor and Suetonius-Hieronymus.

1. *Hieron. Olymp.* 168, 3 (2).	*Sext. Aurel. Vict. de vir. ill.* 81.
Cicero Arpini nascitur matre Helvia, patre equestris ordinis ex regis Volscorum genere.	M. Tullius genere Arpinas patre equite Romano natus, genus a Tullo rege duxit; cf. also Sil. Ital. VIII. 404 sqq.

[19] I am perfectly well aware that the *De viris illustribus* has been assumed by many as having been falsely ascribed to this author, owing to its difference in style and treatment as compared with the *Caesares*. I do not, however, think that *Opitz* (Quaest. de S. A. V., Acta soc. phil. Lips. II. 2, p. 197–280) or *Wölfflin* (Bursian, Jahresber., 1874, p. 790 sqq., also Rh. Mus. 29) or *Haupt* (De auct. de vir. ill. libr. quaest. histor. Diss. Wurzb. 1876) have proven their case, except to their own satisfaction, for not only does the *De viris illustribus* bear unmistakable traces of having been *thoroughly epitomized*, but we are not even certain but that the *Caesares* have been similarly dealt with, which, if true, would satisfactorily explain the difference in style and treatment detected by Wölfflin and others. H. Hildesheimer De libro qui inscribitur de viris ill. etc. Berlin Diss., 1880, has not been accessible to me.

[20] In its abundant use of participial constructions this chapter has perhaps retained a reflex of its original source, such constructions being very characteristic of Suetonius.

Digitized by Google

2. *Hieron. Olymp.* 175, 1.	*Sext. Aurel. Vict. de vir. ill.* 81.
Roscio contra Chrysogonum defenso Cicero Athenas *secessit* et inde post triennium Romam regreditur.	Adolescens Rosciano iudicio eloquentiam et libertatem suam adversus Sullanos ostendit ex quo veritus invidiam Athenas studiorum gratia petivit.

Hieron. Olymp. 184, 2[21] = Aurel. Vict. 81 (Formiis).

To these passages may also be added: *Sueton.* p. 318, 4 R. (= *Sext. Aurel. Vict. de vir. ill.* 2); id. p. 319, 2 (= id. 3, 2); id. p. 320, 5 (= id. 5, 1, 7).

We see, therefore, that the notices concerning Cicero to be found in *Hieronymus* are *certainly* based upon Suetonius' *De viris illustribus*, while those in Victor's *vita* may, without temerity, be attributed to the *same source*.

Keeping these facts constantly in mind, we may now turn to the discussion of the *third* chapter in Plutarch's biography, a narrative, by the way, so perfectly uniform in color and so perfectly coherent, that we must needs attribute the *entire* passage under notice to *one and the same* source.

Ἐν δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ (*i.e.* when "Σύλλας ἐκράτησε καὶ κατάστασίν τινα λαμβάνειν ἔδοξεν ἡ πόλις") Χρυσόγονος ἀπελεύθερος Σύλλα προσαγγείλας τινὸς οὐσίαν ὡς ἐκ προγραφῆς ἀναιρεθέντος αὐτὸς ἐωνήσατο δισχιλίων δραχμῶν. Ἐπεὶ δὲ Ῥώσκιος ὁ υἱὸς καὶ κληρονόμος τοῦ τεθνηκότος ἠγανάκτει καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν ἀπεδείκνυε πεντήκοντα καὶ διακοσίων ταλάντων οὖσαν ἀξίαν, ὅτε Σύλλας ἐλεγχόμενος ἐχαλέπαινε καὶ δίκην πατροκτονίας ἐπῆγε τῷ Ῥωσκίῳ, τοῦ Χρυσογόνου κατασκευάσαντος, ἐβοήθει δ' οὐδείς, ἀλλ' ἀπετρέποντο τοῦ Σύλλα τὴν χαλεπότητα δεδοικότες, οὕτῳ δὴ δι' ἐρημίαν τοῦ μειρακίου τῷ Κικέρωνι προσφυγόντος οἱ φίλοι συμπαρώρμων, ὡς οὐκ ἂν αὐτῷ λαμπροτέραν αὖθις ἀρχὴν πρὸς δόξαν ἑτέραν οὐ δὲ καλλίω γενησομένην. Ἀναδεξάμενος οὖν τὴν συνηγορίαν καὶ κατορθώσας ἐθαυμάσθη, δεδιὼς δὲ τὸν Σύλλαν ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, διασπείρας λόγον, ὡς τοῦ σώματος αὐτῷ θεραπείας δεομένου.

This passage contains two *errors*. The first consists in the statement that the oration *pro Roscio Amerino* was the earliest speech of Cicero, whereas this distinction belongs to the *oratio pro Quinctio*.[21a] Now it so happens, that the single and solitary reference to Nepos

[21] Hieron. Olym. 184, 4, "Cicero ut quibusdam placet interficitur in Caietis" is an interpolation; cf. *Mommsen*, Hermes XXIV. p. 399.

[21a] Cf., however, pro Quint. I. 4, "quod mihi *consuevit* in ceteris causis esse adiumento."

Digitized by Google

and Fenestella, as authorities on the life, or rather writings, of Cicero (in the passage of Gellius quoted above) was called forth by the existence of this very error. What then, it might be argued, could be more plausible than that Nepos (for Fenestella is out of the question) and not Suetonius, as we contend, was the source of Plutarch's information on this point. But this view, however plausible it may appear at first sight, must be altogether abandoned, because of the *second error* alluded to. "*Fearing the anger of Sulla, he left for Greece*, giving out that the poor state of his health made his departure necessary."

This statement flatly contradicts the facts of history, for so far from leaving Rome out of any dread of Sulla, Cicero actually remained in the city almost a year and a half before taking his trip to Greece, delivering in the mean time at least two speeches, one for L. Varenus (cf. Drumann, V. p. 245) and another in behalf of a woman of Arretium (cf. *pro Caecina* 33, 97, and *ad Att.* I. 19, 4).

It must be perfectly evident that no such account can possibly have been found in Nepos; but if so, Plutarch's source for this chapter which, as I was careful to point out, is of a perfectly homogeneous character, must be sought elsewhere. Nor would Tiro or Varro or Fenestella, or any other writer of the time have been guilty of what is both an insult and a deliberate falsehood, even supposing all their writings to have been accessible to Plutarch, which they unquestionably were not. This calumny, in other words, and with it the entire passage, can only have proceeded from some post-Augustan writer, when a legendary halo had already formed about the historical individual, and many incidents in the great orator's life had become obscured by the lapse of time. This writer I contend was *Suetonius*.[22] For singularly enough *both of the errors* just discussed reappear in *but two other authors besides Plutarch, and in only two*, and these are *Hieronymus* and *Sextus Aurelius Victor*. But inasmuch as the fountain, whence these writers drew this *rare* piece of

[22] That we are doing no injustice to *Suetonius* in ascribing to him the passage under discussion is clearly shown by a most remarkable parallelism found in *Suet. Caes.* 4: "Ceterum *composita seditioni civili* Cornelium Dolabellam consularem et triumphalem repetundarum postulavit; absolutoque *Rhodum secedere* statuit et ad *declinandam invidiam* et ut per otium et *requiem* Apollonio Moloni clarissimo tunc dicendi magistro operam daret." All the circumstances here afford a perfectly exact parallel to the narrative of Plutarch, and the motive given for the departure is as similar to the above as it is singularly false.

Digitized by Google

erroneous information was *Suetonius*, it "follows as the night the day" that he constituted the common source of all three. This conclusion, although irresistible, as it appears to me at least, receives additional emphatic confirmation from the fact that the statements under notice, apart from the circumstance that they are found but three times in all extant literature, are also demonstrably *erroneous*, it being well known how much safer a clue to the detection of literary interdependence is frequently afforded by *errors* found in common than by coincidences in matters of fact, the treatment of the same subject often leading to a similarity in its presentation.

In ch. 1 we seem to detect another instance, almost equally certain, of Plutarch's indebtedness to Suetonius:

Κικέρωνος δὲ τὴν μὲν μητέρα λέγουσιν Ἑλβίαν καὶ γεγονέναι καλῶς καὶ βεβιωκέναι, περὶ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἦν πυθέσθαι μέτριον. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν κναφείῳ[22a] τινὶ καὶ γενέσθαι καὶ τραφῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα λέγουσιν, οἱ δ' εἰς Τύλλον Ἄττιον ἀνάγουσι τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ γένους βασιλεύσαντα λαμπρῶς ἐν Οὐολούσκοις καὶ πολεμήσαντα Ῥωμαίοις οὐκ ἀδυνάτως κ.τ.λ.

The source of this passage cannot have been Nepos or Tiro, to the latter of whom it has been customary, by a sort of general consent, to relegate these purely biographical portions of Plutarch's *vita*. This is not only impossible on the face of its very contents, but is sufficiently indicated by the οἱ μὲν . . . οἱ δὲ. On the other hand, the passage under notice possesses the true *color Suetonianus*.[23]

But even allowing this inference to be of too subjective a nature to compel conviction, all doubt as to its truth is again dispelled by two passages in *Hieronymus* and *Sextus Aurelius Victor*. I must quote them again for the purpose of comparison with the Greek cited above.

[22a] This same reproach is made by Calenus, an inveterate enemy of Cicero's (cf. ad Att. XI. 8, 2, etc.), in a scurrilous speech put into his mouth by Dio 46, 4. The genuine oration, to which we may add the invectives of Antony as in all probability containing similar imputations, were undoubtedly known to Suetonius, whereas Plutarch unquestionably read neither.

[23] H. T. Peck, Suetonius, Lives of the Caesars, Holt & Co., New York, 1889, p. X.: "He can only accumulate with patient industry a vast number of details, and set them before us in a mass, leaving us to arrange and weigh and discriminate and judge as best we may. He is a gatherer of facts. . . . Nothing is too unpleasant, nothing too personal, to be left unrecorded. He pins a scandal and adds it to his collection, as a naturalist would a butterfly; but at the same time he does not dwell upon these matters."

Digitized by Google

Hieron. (i.e. *Suetonius*) Olym. 168, 3: *Cicero Arpius nascitur matre Helvia,*[24] *patre equestris ordinis ex rege Volscorum genere.*

Victor de vir. ill. 81 — *M. Tullius genere Arpinas patre equite Romano natus genus a Tullo*[25] *rege duxit.*

Plutarch's indebtedness to Suetonius' *Life of Cicero* having thus been demonstrated by the aid of Hieronymus and Sextus Aurelius Victor, we are now at liberty to look for additional evidence, corroborative of this indebtedness, and fortunately such passages are by no means lacking.

At the end of ch. 4 we are told that Apollonius on hearing Cicero, his pupil, declaim in Greek, cried out in despair that now eloquence too, the only glory that still remained to Greece, would be transferred by him to Rome.[26] The story is intrinsically improbable. It is nowhere alluded to by Cicero, certainly a very suspicious circumstance in his case, for he of all men would have been the least likely to have omitted to speak of it had it been true. Neither Valerius Maximus nor Gellius nor Macrobius nor any other writer of that stamp, in whose works we might reasonably expect to find so memorable an incident recorded, has any knowledge of it. There is, as a matter of fact, but *one other author* besides Plutarch who mentions it, and singularly enough his name is *Sextus Aurelius Victor*, in the *vita Ciceronis* so often quoted by me: "*Molonem Graecum rhetorem tum disertissimum habuit qui flesse dicitur quod per hunc Graecia eloquentiae laude privaretur.*"[27] Relying on the strength of the evidence already presented, we will not, I am confident, hesitate about designating *Suetonius* as the common source of *Plutarch* and *Victor* in this passage.

I have previously taken occasion to prove that in ch. 2, 22 sq., in which the poetry of Cicero is unfavorably criticised, Plutarch had

[24] The *name* of Cicero's mother is given only here and in Plut. She is never alluded to by Cicero, the solitary other reference being Q. Cicero Ep. ad Tironem (ad fam. XVI. 26, 2) "et *matrem* nostram sic olim facere memini."

[25] Cicero speaks of the antiquity of his family some three times: de leg. II. 1, 3; Brut. 16, 32; Tusc. I. 16, 38 (Servius Tullius).

[26] "Σὲ μὲν, ὦ Κικέρων, ἐπαινῶ καὶ θαυμάζω, τῆς δὲ Ἑλλάδος οἰκτείρω τὴν τύχην, ὁρῶν ἃ μόνα τῶν καλῶν ἡμῖν ὑπελείπετο καὶ ταῦτα Ῥωμαίοις διὰ σοῦ προσγενόμενα, παιδείαν καὶ λόγον."

[27] It might be mentioned in passing that a very similar anecdote is related of *John Reuchlin* and *Argyropolus*, whose lectures on Thucydides the German scholar took occasion to attend while an embassador to the court of Pope Alex. VI.; cf. *Raumer*, Gesch. der Paedagogik, I. p. 95.

Digitized by Google

recourse to some post-Augustan source. *The same is true* of ch. 40, 4–24, in which he treats of Cicero's great merits in enriching the Latin language by the coinage of new words, and then again reverts to his *poetical efforts*. I do not, however, contend for source-identity because of any belief that the later chapter bears any internal evidence of a post-Augustan origin, for it does not, but simply because there can be no possible doubt that ch. 40, *on the very face of its contents*, is derived from the same fountain as ch. 2; and as this is necessarily post-Augustan and non-Tironian,[28] it follows that ch. 40, 4–24, is so too. But of all post-Augustan writers possibly accessible to Plutarch, there is not one to whom passages of this literary character can with more justice be attributed than to Suetonius Tranquillus, whose predilection on this point is well attested by innumerable examples. Adding to this the positive evidence already presented of Plutarch's indebtedness to Suetonius, the inference just made as to the source of ch. 2, 22 and ch. 40, 4–24, will be well-nigh irresistible.

I have purposely reserved for the last the discussion of one other passage which is calculated to give additional confirmation, if such, indeed, be needed, to the argument which I have been advocating in this paper. In ch. 44 the biographer narrates a dream of Cicero's which is practically and substantially identical with Cicero's dream concerning Augustus, as recorded by *Suetonius* (Aug. c. 94). Neither writer mentions his authority, the commentators on Suetonius are silent in regard to it, and the scholars who have written on the sources of the Greek *vita* attribute such passages to Tiro, in want of anything better, a proceeding, by the way, as easy as it is gratuitous. And yet the original source of this anecdote can be determined with singular accuracy from a passage of *Tertullian de anima*, c. 46: "M. Tullius Cicero Augustum civilium turbinum cultorem *de somnio* narrat quod in *vitæ illius commentariis* conditum est." There is every probability that this dream was also related in Suetonius' *Life of Cicero*, which, if true, might well account for the succinct narrative of it in his *Life of Augustus*. But if so, the question at once suggests itself, whether the ὑπομνήματα of Augustus constituted the common source of both Plutarch and Suetonius, or whether the latter author is again to be looked upon as the source of the former. Though not disposed categorically to assert what can never be fully substantiated by proof,

[28] That ch. 40 is not dependent upon Tiro's work, as has been almost unanimously assumed by scholars, is plainly indicated by the ὅς φασιν (line 12) and the λέγεται (line 18 Sint).

Digitized by Google

I am nevertheless very much inclined to favor the second view; for, although Plutarch quotes these Memoirs five times in all (see the list above), there is but a very remote probability of his having ever read a single line of them, except at second hand, while Suetonius, on the contrary, is known to have made an extensive use of the emperor's autobiography.[29]

With this I close my paper, which I am only sorry to say is not nearly so carefully elaborated as I would like to have made it, if more time and space had been allotted to me. But be this as it may, its object will be more than accomplished if the philological jury, into whose hands the case is now given, should decide that the arguments adduced to prove that Suetonius' *vita Ciceronis* constituted one of the sources of Plutarch's life of the great Roman orator are at least formidable enough to merit attention, if not absolutely convincing.[30]

[29] Among other passages *possibly* taken from Suetonius might be mentioned c. 5, 29, 12 sq.; 41, 1, especially c. 24, and particularly some highly unfavorable criticisms of Cicero that are met with in Plutarch's life (omitting similar expressions in the narrative of the orator's political history, the sources of which were not discussed in this paper), for most of these are of so unfriendly a nature as to exclude Nepos, or Tiro as possible sources, their biographies being entirely eulogistic or apologetic.

[30] A possible chronological objection, which, if valid, would strike at the very root of my arguments, may be briefly discussed in a note, it being easily disposed of. Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* was written at a *later* date than his Life of *Sulla* (cf. Michaelis de ordine vitarum parall. Plutarchi, Berlin, 1875, Weber, p. 1–39). Now, the latter happily furnishes us with a "terminus post quem," for in ch. 21 Plutarch, describing the battle of Orchomenus, fought in 85 B.C., adds that many relics of the dead were found in the neighboring marshes, *σχέδον ἐτῶν διακοσίων ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης ἐκείνης διαγεγονότων*. This brings us down to the year *115 A.D.* (cf. Holden, Plutarch's Sulla, p. xxiv.). The *vita Ciceronis* was consequently composed later than this date.

Suetonius Tranquillus is generally supposed to have been born about 75 A.D.; he was appointed *magister epistolarum* to Hadrian, probably in 119. He was, therefore, at the time of the composition of Plutarch's Cicero, some forty years old. There is consequently nothing to prevent us from supposing that his work, *De viris illustribus*, or parts of it, had at that time long been published, there being absolutely no evidence to the contrary. Pliny the Younger, in a letter (V. 10) probably written in 105 A.D., begs S. to publish his *volumina*. The *Caesares* are undoubtedly his latest, as they are his maturest, work.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

Sextii Aurelii Victoris vitae Ciceronis [epitome] (*de Viris Illustribus*, c. 81).

Marcus Tullius Cicero genere Arpinas, patre equite Romano natus genus a Tito Tatio rege duxit.[1] Adolescens Rosciano iudicio eloquentiam et libertatem suam adversus Sullanos ostendit ex quo veritus invidiam Athenas studiorum gratia petivit[2] ubi Antiochum Academicum philosophum studiose audivit.[3] Inde eloquentiae gratia Asiam post Rhodum petiit[4] ubi Molonem Graecum rhetorem tum disertissimum magistrum habuit qui flesse dicitur quod per hunc Graecia eloquentiae laude privaretur.[5] Quaestor Siciliam habuit.[6] Praetor Ciliciam latrociniis liberavit.[7] Consul coniuratos capites punivit.[8] Mox invidia P. Clodii[9] instinctuque Caesaris[10] et Pompeii quos dominationis suspectos eadem qua quondam Sullanos libertate perstrinxerat, sollicitatis Pisone et Gabinio css. qui Macedoniam Syriamque provincias[11] in stipendium operae huius acceperant in exsilium[12] actus mox ipso referente Pompeio[13] rediit eumque civili bello secutus est.[14] Quo victo veniam a Caesare ultro accepit[15] quo interfecto Augustum fovit.[16] Antonium hostem indicavit.[17] Et cum Triumviros se fecissent Caesar, Lepidus Antoniusque[18] concordia non aliter visa est inter eos iungi posse nisi Tullius necaretur[19] qui immissis ab Antonio percussoribus[20] cum forte Formiis quiesceret imminens exitium corvi[21] auspicio didicit et fugiens[22] occisus est. Caput ad Antonium relatum.[22]

[1] Cf. Plut. Cic. c. 1 S. Hieron. l.c.
[2] Plut. Cic. c. 3 Hieron. l.c.
[3] Cic. c. 4, init.
[4] Cic. c. 4, 24.
[5] Cic. c. 4, 26.
[6] Cic. c. 6.
[7] Cic. c. 36, 14.
[8] Cic. c. 10–23.
[9] Cic. c. 28 sq.
[10] Cic. c. 30, 30.
[11] Cic. c. 30, 25.
[12] Cic. c. 31 sq.
[13] Cic. c. 33.
[14] Cic. c. 37.
[15] Cic. c. 39.
[16] Cic. c. 40, 24.
[17] Cic. c. 45, 30.
[18] Cic. c. 46, 22.
[19] Cic. c. 46, 26.
[20] Cic. c. 47, 48.
[21] Cic. c. 47, etiam Val. Max. 19, 15 ["cum enim in villa Caietana esset corvus in conspectu eius hororum mansit."]
[22] Cic. c. 48, 49.

Digitized by Google

III. — *Sex-denoting Nouns in American Languages.*

By ALBERT S. GATSCHET,

OF THE U. S. BUREAU OF ETHNOLOGY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE most cursory consideration of the things in nature teaches us the fact, that there are *living* and *lifeless* objects in the world around us, that is, beings which spontaneously show signs of inward life, and objects deprived of the signs of life or appearing to be so. To reach such a degree of mental apperception our race had to pass through a long period of training and experience, and among rude and primitive nations the human mind has not reached this stage of logical perfection; much less can this be said of the intelligence of the primordial man of many thousand years ago. The primordial man easily confounded *action*, *motion*, *variation*, and *change* with *life*, this being a natural consequence of the animism which then pervaded all human understanding. Man at that remote period also confounded cause and effect with sequence in time, and both errors were the fruitful agencies which produced that wonderful maze of religious ideas, myths, and superstitions which are now being published in the literature of folk-lore. Objects like the wind, lightning, dew, or fog could then be regarded as animate as well as pearls, precious stones, and flowers, although we would now laugh at the idea that there is life in them. But primeval ideas like these still survive in the *gender* of some languages, part of which are spoken by the most cultured nations.

But besides the above another distinction was received into the noun and other parts of speech. Man and the higher animals, as quadrupeds and birds, were known to be divided in two sexes, and an intimation of these was expressed in the grammatic forms of some languages. In the Aryan languages the majority of the lower animals and plants were also given a grammatic sex, but most other objects of nature were relegated into what is now called the neuter gender. In other languages, mainly of the agglutinative type, these were relegated into a large class of "inanimates." The large majority of all languages which are distinguishing gender in the noun, know of *two* genders only, and a number of tongues in all parts of the world know

Digitized by Google

nothing of any gender- or sex-distinction whatever,[1] some of these, as Neopersian, Lettish and English, having lost them in course of time.

The personal pronoun is that part of speech in which the masculine sex is *at first* distinguished from the feminine by separate words or grammatic signs. From the personal pronoun this distinction gradually invades the possessive, reflective, demonstrative, interrogative and relative pronoun. Sex may be made distinct in the pronoun of one, but not of another dialect of the same linguistic family, a fact which I have observed in the Kalapuya family of Northwestern Oregon. Sex-distinction also exists in the third persons of the pronouns in some Iroquois dialects, but not in the Cherokee language, which is related to them. In Iroquois dialects the distinction between *he* and *she* extends to persons only, not to any of the animals. In the Timucua, once spoken in the Floridian peninsula, o, oqe is *he*, ya *she;* but sex does not appear to be marked in any other manner in this language, which is so extremely rich in pronominal and verbal forms.

From the personal and possessive pronoun sex-distinction passes into the *verb*, which in agglutinative languages is nothing but a modified noun. In the verb sex-distinction is less frequent than in the pronoun. Of American languages some Iroquois dialects have it in the third persons of the singular, dual and plural of the pronoun only; in the eastern hemisphere the languages which present this feature most conspicuously are those of the Semitic stock.

Distinction of sex in the noun.

The noun proper or substantive and the adjective are the parts of speech in which sex-denoting affixes are most unfrequently met with. The majority of all tongues will resort to separate terms to indicate sex in human beings and animals, and place them in apposition to the noun either before or after it. In Maya dialects these sex-appositeS have been ground down so as to represent mere prefixes; ah- designates the male, but in fact means *proprietor, possessor;* ish-, sh- represents the female sex, and originally referred to the reproduction of the species. Thus in the Maya of Yucatan mehen is *son*, ish-mehen *daughter;* Ah-Pech *man* called *Pech*, Ish-Pech *woman* called *Pech*. To designate the sex of animals, this language uses other

[1] To avoid misapprehension, I call henceforth *gender* the categories of the animate and inanimate, *sex* those of the masculine and feminine.

Digitized by Google

terms: shibil-coh *male puma*, shibil signifying *male*. The Quiché language, closely related to Maya, furnishes such examples as: Tziquin, nom. pr. masc. "Bird" — Sh-Tziquin, name of his wife; zu *flute*, ah-zu *musician;* achih-mun *male slave*, ishok-mun *female slave*, achih meaning *male* and ishok *woman*.

But this is agglutination only; affixes like these are not real, inseparable grammatic marks to designate sex, but only terms used in forming compound nouns, just as we say *she-fox* for *vixen*. However, we find in several not sex-denoting American languages instances of metaphoric appellations of inanimate things referring to sexual distinction. They show how deeply engrafted in the human mind is the tendency towards animism. Thus the Caddo name for Mississippi river is Báhat sássin *Mother of rivers*, for sássin means *mother* as well as *wife*, and the name shows that that river is here symbolized as the "receiver of many rivers." In the Maskoki languages *thumb* is "mother of fingers"; in Creek íngi ítchki, in Chikasa ílbak-íshke, in Hitchití ílb-íki, the literal rendering of all these terms being "of one's fingers their mother."

Sex-denoting affixes.

What seems to be a genuine sex-denoting affix to the noun appears in one of the South-American linguistic families of the northern part of that continent. This stock is commonly designated as *Carib*, but since this name has been used in an exceedingly vague and indistinct manner, it is preferable to call the dialects in which sex-denoting affixes have been studied, by their special names.

Copying from Fr. Müller, *Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft*, II, p. 324, the dialects in which this feature is observed are the Arowak and the Goajira, sex being indicated in adjectives and participles as well as in substantives. In *Arowak* we have:

boy basabanti; *girl* basabantu.
little boy basabanti-kan; *little girl* basabantu-kan.
a good man üsati; *a good woman* üsatu.
loving (man) kansiti; *loving* (woman) kansitu.
dying (man) ahuduti; *dying* (woman) ahudutu.
child (male) elonti; *child* (female) elontu.

In the *Goajira* language, spoken north of the Gulf of Maracaibo, the -i of the masculine answers to a feminine in -e, as follows:

merchant oikari; fem. oikare.
fisherman apüshaχori; fem. apüshaχore.

Digitized by Google

good anashi ; fem. anase.
dead autushi ; fem. autuse.
little morsashi ; fem. morsase.
sorry, trist, maχuaintshi ; fem. maχuainre.

The language of the Kalinago or *Caribs of the West Indies* or Antillian islands is surviving upon a few islands only ; it is related to both dialects above mentioned, and shows the same sex-denoting suffixes as observed in Arowak (Müller, ibid. p. 339) :

a beautiful man iropo^{n}ti ; *a beautiful woman* irupatu.
beloved (man) ki^{n}shi^{n}ti ; *beloved* (woman) ki^{n}shi^{n}tu.
murderer aparuti ; *murderess* aparutu.

I do not have the works of Father Breton before me, who is the chief authority upon this insular language ; but from the extracts in L. Adam, *Examen Grammatical,* p. 7 (1878), it appears that the personal and the possessive pronouns also differed according to the sex of the one speaking in the third person : l-iem *he does,* t-iem *she does ;* l-aku *his eye,* t-aku *her eye.* Moreover, the females among themselves spoke another language than the men, and though both languages were called *Caribbean,* Fr. Müller regards them as radically distinct from each other.[1]

The *Taensa* people, the existence of which is recorded in the annals from 1680 to 1812, lived between Vicksburg and Natchez City on the west side of the Mississippi river, near the Tonikas, and about 1714 removed to Mobile Bay. The grammar, vocabulary and poetic collection of the Taensa language, which was published in Paris in 1882, has been attacked in regard to its authenticity, and since the arguments brought forward against it have not convinced many scientists,[2] I shall make mention of the curious system of sex-distinction which the grammar contains. This distinction occurs in the pronouns and in the substantive. The pronouns with sex-forms are *thou* wi, fem. wiâ ; *he* su, *she* suâ ; *ye* wig, fem. wiâg ; *they* sug, fem. suâg. The interrogative pronoun wekmâr, fem. wekmârâ *who ?* the emphatic and expletive forms of the personal pronoun all bear the marks of sex-distinction. When a masculine form corresponds to a feminine substantive, the ending of the latter is -â ; and this in some instances passes over into the adjective when this is used attributively.

[1] Cf. also Ober, Fred. A., Camps in the Caribbees. Boston, 1880, pp. 100–103.

[2] Dr. D. G. Brinton, in *American Antiquarian,* 1885, pp. 108–113; 275, 276; A. S. Gatschet, in *Revue de Linguistique* of Paris, 1888, pp. 199–208, and several articles written by Lucien Adam and Julien Vinson.

Digitized by Google

The terminals -ao, -a-u indicate inanimate things, but nouns in -ao, -a-u are regarded as of the feminine sex.

Tonika.

The only sex-denoting language which I have had the opportunity to study on the spot is the Tonika or Túniχka of Eastern Louisiana, discovered by me in the autumn of 1886. It proved to be a language heretofore unknown to science, and by its strange peculiarities deserves to be carefully studied and compared with other languages, especially with those spoken in its nearest vicinity: the Ná'htchi, Shetimasha, Atákapa and the sundry dialects of the wide-stretching Maskóki family.

In the pronoun, verb and noun this southern tongue distinguishes two sexes, the masculine and feminine; inanimate things belong either to one or the other of the two, and abstract nouns are chiefly or exclusively of the feminine class. If an inanimate order ever existed, it has been merged into the above two, as in the modern Romance languages the neuter has merged into the masculine.

In the noun the *male sex* is made distinct in the singular by the prefix uk- (u-), or by the suffix -ku (-k^n, -χku, -χk, -k); in the plural by the prefix sik-, sig-, or by the suffixed pronoun sä'^{n}, sä'ma, hé säma. The *female sex* has a distinguishing mark in the prefix tik- (tí'h-, tig-, ti-, t-) or in the suffix -ktchi (-χtchi, -χtch, -ktch, -kts, -'htchi, -tch, -ts) in the singular number, while in the plural it has sin, si^n, si, hé sin, hé sinma, placed either before or after the noun to which they belong.

All these affixes are either pronouns or of pronominal origin. They are frequently omitted where we expect to find them, and the masculine affixes much more so than those of the opposite sex.

A partial list of PRONOUNS *is as follows:*

héku, hék^n *this one, this;* fem. héktchi, hé'htch; pl. hé sä^n; hé sin. héku and héktchi may also refer to inanimate things.

Personal pronoun:

1 sg. íma *I;* emphatic í'mata^n *myself.*
2 sg. ma *thou* (masc.) hä'ma (fem.); emphatic máta^n, hä'mata^n.
3 sg. úwi *he,* tí'htchi *she;* emphatic úwita^n, tí'htchita^n.

Digitized by Google

1 pl. ínima *we;* emphatic ínimata^{n} *ourselves.*

2 pl. wínima *ye* (masc.), hínima (fem.); emphatic wínimata^{n}, hínimata^{n}.

3 pl. sä'^{n}ma, sä'^{n} *they* (masc.), sínima, sí^{n} (fem.); emphatic sä'^{n}mata^{n}, fem. sínimata^{n}.

Possessive pronoun:

lúk *tongue,* ta lúk *the tongue, a tongue, tongue.*

1 sg. íluk *my tongue.*

2 sg. wíluk *thy tongue,* fem. híluk.

3 sg. úluk *his tongue,* fem. tíluk *her tongue.*

1 pl. î'^{n}luk *our tongues.*

2 pl. wî'^{n}luk *your tongues,* fem. hî'^{n}luk.

3 pl. síluk *their tongues,* fem. sî'^{n}luk.

The word ri *house,* provided with possessive prefixes, runs as follows:

1 sg. ígri *my house;* 2 sg. wígri, f. hígri; 3 sg. úgri, f. tígri.

1 pl. íhĕri *our house;* 2 pl. wíhĕri, f. híhĕri; 3 pl. sígri, f. sí'hri.

When ri *house,* which is of the feminine gender, stands in the plural, it becomes ri-sin *houses,* lit. "house-these" or "house-they," and the "conjugation" proceeds as follows:

1 sg. ígrisin or ta rí'htinsin *my houses.*

2 sg. wígrisin *thy houses,* fem. hígrisin.

3 sg. úgrisin *his houses,* tígrisin *her houses.*

1 pl. ihĕrisin *our houses.*

2 pl. wí'hrisin *your houses,* fem. hí'hĕrisin.

3 pl. sígrisin *their houses,* fem. sí'hrisin; or tá n'tchi sín sí'hri, lit. "the-women-their-houses."

In following up a portion of the personal inflection of the *verb,* similar pronominal elements are found to occur.

Present tense of ságu TO EAT, declarative form:

1 sg. ságukani *I am eating.*

2 sg. ságuki; fem. ságuka.

3 sg. sagukúna, ságuku; fem. sagúkati.

indef. sagúkiti *somebody is eating.*

1 du. saginá^{n} *we two are eating.*

2 du. saguwína^{n}; fem. saguhína^{n}.

3 du. sagu-úna^{n}; fem. sagusína^{n}.

Digitized by Google

1 pl. ságiti^{n} and ságiti *we are eating.*

2 pl. sagúwiti; fem. sagúhiti.

3 pl. sagúkiti; fem. sagúsiti.

Although there is a dual in the verb, I have been unable to obtain a dual for the pronoun and substantive differing from the plural.

Now let us see how these different signs of sex are applied in the Tonika sentence. Let us consider them separately, beginning with the:

Masculine.

kuá túχk^{n} óshka tádshara *the claws of a little bird;* kuá being masc., túχku or túχk^{n}, túχk *little,* is of the same sex.

héku náχk *like this man,* or *like this thing.*

ikontéku lúpui wéran a-áχkinta *my father-he* (ikonté-ku) *died, while I was hunting.*

kán harī'a ta ríχku (or táχku, abbr.)? *how tall is this tree?*

táyani-shi-k^{n} ríχti míshti tá sá-tek^{n} ukpéri *the buffalo is stronger than the horse;* lit. "cattle-male-he strong more the horse-he him surpasses": uk- is the masc. object-particle of the singular, referring here to the horse.

tóni sik'háyi hihá-iχta lúp hót' ónta *The old people in this village are all dead;* lit. "people those-old in-there dead all are"; sik- being an instance of the masculine plural.

Feminine.

óka núχtchi tú *little girl;* lit. "child-woman-small"; tú *little* need not take the fem. ending (tú'htchi) here, for the sex is already pointed at by núχtchi.

táχkuri héktch imé'htini *this fence is mine* (táχkuri *fence*).

tá yúnka'htch (or tá yúnka) títik ma-itóru ā'ra *a rope is crossing the creek;* lit. "the rope creek across is lying"; if yúnka was masc., the verb would be ū'ra.

rá-aχkini ī'gatchik lúpiti'htch *I grew up when my mother was dead.*

ígatchiktch tí'htch, Béluksi núχtchi, iknaχshä'ki *my mother, a Beluxi woman, brought me* (here). In these two examples tí'htch is added reverentially to the term *my mother* (ī'gatchi).

ta tíraktch irúkati húriwi *the cloth* (or *sheet*) *floats in the wind;* lit. "the-she-cloth-she floats-she wind-in," íra *cloth* being preceded and followed by feminine affixes.

Digitized by Google

ta riχkéku (or tárkeku, táχkuk) hárīa tári'tch atápära *the tree is as tall as the house;* lit. "the tree tall the house-she equals."

táχkuk hárīa, tígri kä'ha *the tree is lower than the house;* lit. "the tree tall, she-house is-not."

táχtchiksh ti'hkorak(i) *full moon;* lit. "luminary she-round."

lá-u táχtchiksh ríkĕhä, áχshukun táχtchiksh tikamíshti *the moon is smaller than the sun;* lit. "night-luminary great-not, day-luminary her surpasses."

tá-ushi rómana míshtik, ta mákak tikpéri *water is heavier than oil;* lit. "water (for ta wí'hshi) heavy more, the oil her surpasses."

ta wíshäna máχkina míshti hótu si^{n}péri *this lake is deeper than all others;* lit. "the lake deep more all them (fem.) surpasses."

yakanikáχtcha kí, láho^{n} tuk yakanikáχtcha *if I come, I come early.* Láho^{n} tuk "small morning" gives *no* indication of the feminine gender of láhon, láhoni.

ta héri'htchi tchúima *he seizes the canoe.*

táru hésin ra (or rata) *these nuts are hard.*

ta niriwä'ka sin *the cemeteries.*

hé sin hótu tíksa tchóhaki *she led all these dogs;* tíksa *female dog,* hé sin *these* (fem. pl.), hótu *all.*

The demonstrative particle *ta* preceding many of the nouns can best be understood when we regard it as an article corresponding in most cases to our definite article *the,* and indicative of the singular and plural number of both sexes.

These examples plainly show that there is a real sex-distinction in this language for animate beings as well as for inanimate things; that the pronoun ku, k^{u} is always placed *after* its noun, adjective, or pronoun to designate the masculine gender; that the more frequent ti'h-, ti-, t- is placed *before* it to designate the feminine, but when it appears in the shape of ti'htch, -'htch, -ksh, -'tch is *suffixed* to it; that in many instances the signs of either class are omitted altogether.

The point which we have to examine next is, what objects or categories of objects are assigned to the one or the other sex. For we find that the attribution of some sex to inanimate things must have started from the same mental activity which has assigned to the *sun* a male sex in the classic and a female in the Germanic languages, and to the *moon* just the reverse, although there is nothing male or female to be perceived in either of the two celestial bodies. It was the same energy of the mind which caused primitive men to produce myths by personifying the inanimate objects of nature observed

Digitized by Google

around them. The Tonika language is the more remarkable on this account, because it is the only language heretofore discovered *in America* which divides all objects of creation into two great sex-categories.

Of the *adjectives* the large majority appear to have a simple form, from which the masculine is derived by suffixing -ku, -χku, -k^{u}, the feminine by appending one of the aforementioned affixes. The adjective ní'hsara *young* forms neither of the two, as the sex is expressed by the noun accompanying this adjective or implied in it: óne ní'hsara *boy*, núχtchi ní'hsara *girl;* lit. "man young," "woman young."

We have the following instances:

tä'^{n} *great, large*	masc. tä'ku, tä'gu	fem. tä''htchi
tú *small, little*	túχku, túχk	túχkush
kóra^{n} *round*	kóraku	kóraktch
méli *black*	méliku	méliktchi
míli *red*	míliku	míliktchi
rówa *white*	rówaku	rówaktchi
táχkir *smutty, dirty*	táχkirku	táχkiri'htch
máka^{n} *fat*	makáχku	maká'htchi
ríχ'sa *spotted, dotted*	ríχ'saku	ríχ'satch

The sex of the substantive is not by any means always expressed in the adjective accompanying it, and this appears to be dictated either by the run of the sentence or be a matter of pure convenience. Thus we have tashkaráχponi (fem.) rówa *white stocking*, though t. is feminine; tíχshuma máka^{n} *or* t. maká'htchi *fat meat;* tíχshuma sépi *lean meat*, instead of sépi'htch. Especially the sign of the masculine is frequently omitted.

Of the *Terms of relationship*, which correspond to each other in both sexes, many appear in this language with the sexual affixes appended, and are always connected with their possessive prefixes *my, his, her*, just like the parts of the human and animal body:

é'hkutuhuk *my son*, é'hkutuhuktch(i) *my daughter.*

éχkutu wálik *my step-son*, éχkutu wáliktch *my step-daughter.*

íχtchaku *my grandfather*, íχtchaktch *my grandmother.*

étuku mashíku *my father-in-law*, étuku mashí'htchi *my mother-in-law.* Thus in the formation of the degrees of relationship we perceive a close analogy with the sex-distinction in adjectives.

Digitized by Google

Terms designating *male persons*, their occupations, employments, generally show no affix designating sex, or if they do, it is -ku, -k^{n}. Terms descriptive of *women*, their occupations, etc., have either no affix, or tí'h-, -'htchi or some other of the above-mentioned feminine affixes.

Quadrupeds and *birds* (kúa) are of the masculine gender, unless the female sex is pointed out by a noun standing appositively. There is no word in the language corresponding exactly to our term animal, unless it should be contained in sá^{n}, which now means *dog;* sá tä'^{n} *horse* would then be "large animal." Examples: yánish *cattle*, yánish káχshi *buffalo*, pä'ha sá^{n} *wolf*, tchúla *fox*, yá, í-a *deer*, yátä^{n} *elk*, lit. "large deer," núχki *beaver*, rushtá^{n} *rabbit*, rushtá^{n} tä'^{n} *sheep*, lit. "large rabbit," iyushäla *opossum* and *woodrat*, kíwa *weasel*, íyutä *hog*, mínu *cat*, híχku *mouse;* kúa tú *bird* (lit. "small bird"), kúa tú and túχku *humming-bird*, kúa míli *cardinal*, éla, ä'la *buzzard*, yé'hta tä^{n} *turkey*, shími *pigeon;* but ä'χka *crow* is represented to be a feminine.

The *lower animals*, as amphibians, reptiles, fish, insects and mollusks, appear to be considered as of the masculine gender: kóχku *turtle*, kó'hsuki *crab*, ná-ara^{n} *snake*, nā'ra^{n} tä'^{n} *rattlesnake*, viz. "snake large," níni *fish*, ä'ya *fly*, í-unari *salmon*, ómaχka *alligator*, sutáχshu *grasshopper*, shíriχka *ant*, lúpiran *chamaeleon*, námi *louse*, shíla pä'χka *bedbug*, lit. "fat beast," kē *bee*, kē mírka, míχ'ka *wasp*, kē wísta *honey*, takírka *mollusk*, úχshik *shell*. The generic term for all the smaller animals is shíla or shíla tú, which the French Creoles call "le petit bétail," and is of the male sex. The term for *frog*, udshéχka, is said to be feminine.

Plants, *trees*, *bushes* and *weeds* are of the masculine sex also, and ríχku *tree* and *wood* is masc. as well. The term for *plant*, tápa and tápaktch, is fem. and means "what grows" or "is planted"; tapákani *I plant*. Examples of plants, all masculine, are as follows: ríχku sánu *pacan-tree*, and sánu *pacan-nut*, ú'hshpa *white oak*, ríχku kíru *peach-tree*, ráyi *mulberry-tree*, yúgmoχku *herb*, *grass*, *weed;* erá, rá *tobacco*, yítä *batate*, *sweet potato*, shúlik ótaka *melon*, shúχka *pumpkin*.

Of *rocks*, *stones* and *minerals* the following are masculine: shíχka *stone*, *rock*, *flint-stone;* háχtchu *salt*, láχspi, lá'spi *metal*, *iron*, náχta *bluff on a river*, etc.

The *celestial bodies* and the divisions of *time* are considered feminine by these Indians, as is also háliktch, abbrev. háli, hál *earth*, and

Digitized by Google

its derivatives, perhaps because the personified Earth is regarded as the mother of all beings.

We mention the following instances: táχtchiksh, abbr. táχtchi "luminary" and *sun;* áχshukun t. *sun*, lit. "day-luminary"; lá-u t. *moon*, lit. "night-luminary"; táχtchi tipulá *star;* láhoni *morning*, te'hkalugéki *noon*, tohónagi *afternoon*, lá-aki, lā'ki *evening*, tíhika *summer* and *year;* tíhika tú *spring*, lit. "little summer"; táχsaba *winter*, táχsaba tú *autumn*, lit. "little winter"; rúina *heat*, yúpaχta *the cold*, alutápa^n *harvest* also belong to the feminine order. Among the derivatives and compounds of ,háli *earth* we have: halúpish *mud*, háli-sáman *brick*, lit. "earth baked"; halú'hta *sole*. But the term hal-ukíni *village*, *district*, lit. "placed upon the earth," is masculine.

The points of the compass are derivatives of verbs or nouns, and all of the feminine sex: táχsapash *north*, lit. "cold"; táχtchi píka-tish *east*, tíhikash *south*, lékatish *west*, lit. "loss (of the sun)."

Some other *objects of nature* are of the feminine order also: wí'hshi *water*, *liquid* becomes tá-ush(i) when the article ta is placed before it: tá-ush míli *river*, lit. "red water"; háχpushi *ashes*, ontétish *milk*, tóra *ice*, toratíni *hoarfrost*, yáχku *vegetable poison*, shíχtika *venom*, télia and télia'htch *shadow* and *soul*, also *reflection on the water*. The term yí *pain*, *invisible sickness* is feminine, and hence all names of diseases are of the same gender: íni yí *toothache*, e'htiníyu yí *heart disease*, táshki- rúpa *diarrhœa*. Yúri *visible sickness* is of the same sex.

Abstract nouns are all considered as of the female sex, for they are feminine adjectives made into substantives: káχshi *true* and *truth*, *reality;* ríχki'htch *force*, *strength*, from ríχki *strong;* taχkiṛítchi *filth*, from táχkiṛ *dirty;* náka *war*, *battle* is masculine and appears to be considered as a concrete, not as an abstract noun.

The names for the *parts* of the human and animal *body* and of *plants* are about equally divided between the two sexes.

Of masculine nouns we have: íni *my tooth*, éruk *my neck*, í'hs-tuksuk *my eye*, irí'hshi *my nose*, ínishi *my breast*, é'htuka *my shoulder*, i'hkení *my hand*, i. lábu *my right hand*, lit. "good hand," eyumä'ra *my wrist*, hanímu *fist*, úyu^n *bowels*, ilákashi *my hair*, táχki *bone*, íshki *my posteriors*, é'hshka *my foot*, and ó'hshka *stalk* and *root of plant*, yúχtar *feather*, *plumage*, óχsa *tail* of animal, aχkatíni *pimple*.

Of feminine nouns there are: í'hkin tírwash *my finger-nail*, e'htiníyu *my heart*, é'hsini *my head*, itáχkishi *my skin* (and *bark* of plants),

Digitized by Google

óli'hka and ólika'htch *my liver*, tá-idsha *flesh, meat*, éyu and éyu'htch *my arm*, ópushka *lung*, tchára *toe*, túχsu *grain, seed*, rú *nut*.

Natural objects classed into the masculine order of inanimates are as follows: éshku *rain*, éshku rahíni *thunder*, tóa *snow*, hóχka *hole*, áyi, á-i *fire*, húri *wind*, ta húri ku *the wind blows*, apáru *sky* and *clear sky;* hí'hshuka *dew* appears to be of both sexes.

Manufactured objects are thought to belong to both sexes, but the number of those belonging to the feminine possibly prevails over that of the opposite sex.

Masculines are: hässá^{n} *saw*, pólu'hki *bottle*, takáχti *key*, tíra táruhi *clothes-brush*, tanáha^{n} *back* (of chair), kún kúrini *drum*, lit. "noise to assemble," tchúhi *cushion, pillow*, áyi wotchúra *chimney*, héyutana *bed*, ta póχku *bed-cover*, kóti *lodgement*, wúχku *hat*, rí áwähan *doorway*.

Feminines are: wishkatáhi *bow*, lit. "bow with cord"; róhina *book, paper, newspaper*, etc., from rówa *white;* íra *cloth, clothing, garment*, úshik *spoon*, skálaχk *shilling*, from Span. escalino; láχspi ta éyu *beads*, hí'hturak tára^{n} *spider-web*, yúnka and yúnka'htch *rope*, rí *house, lodge*, rí káhi *floor*, rí pókuni *roof, thatch*.

Readers perusing this long list of nouns will obviously notice that some of these terms have lost such endings as -i or -u, and that others have a long and an abbreviated form used simultaneously. There are whole categories of nouns which distinctly belong to one grammatic sex only, like the names for the points of the compass, all of which are feminine exclusively, and moreover end in -sh throughout. But outside of the terminals of sex, -ku and -ktchi, with their phonologic alterations, no suffix can be found which gives an indication of sex *by itself*, as we observe it, *e.g.* with Latin *-tas* and German *-heit*.

The problem now confronts us: do we have in the Tonika language a division of nouns into an animate or vitalistic and an inanimate or non-vitalistic class, or a real sex-division into male and female nouns? To this I reply:

Had the originators of the gender-system embodied in Tonika started from the purpose of separating the objects showing life from those of the inanimate world, they would not have placed animals, plants, minerals, many objects of nature and the body's organs into the same class. Neither would they have done this, if they desired to distinguish the noble from the ignoble (whatsoever this distinction may amount to in an Indian's mind), the active from the non-active, or the organic from the inorganic, a conception which could hardly

Digitized by Google

originate in minds untrained in natural science. That the feminine sex contains, or originally embraced, only such terms which describe objects hidden within others, or not on the surface, or enclosing other objects, and abstract ideas, is a theory agreeing with many terms of the list, but not with all the facts on hand, and has therefore to be discarded.

The best we can do in our present state of knowledge is to assume that the early Tonikas started from the two sexes observed among men and animals, and found in all the other objects of nature, and in abstract ideas, some fancied analogy to males and females, and thus classified their nouns.

Digitized by Google

IV. — *Metrical Observations on a Northumbrianized Version of the Old English Judith.*[1]

By ALBERT S. COOK,

PROFESSOR IN YALE UNIVERSITY.

THE attempt to restore a poem to the dialect in which it was originally written, and from which it is supposed to have been afterwards transcribed, is not wholly unprecedented. R. Payne Knight undertook this for Homer in his Carmina Homerica, Ilias et Odyssea, 1820, and has been followed in our day by Fick (Die homerische Odyssee, 1883 ; Die homerische Ilias, 1886). A similar endeavor to reconstruct the original strophic form of Béowulf was made a few years ago by Möller (Das Altenglische Volksepos in der ursprünglichen strophischen Form, 1883). It is needless to specify the services which such a version, if properly made, is capable of rendering to scholarship. For our purpose it will be preferable to measure the results which, in the subjoined text, have been obtained on the basis of phonology and inflexion alone, by subjecting them to the independent test of prosody. The metrical laws of Old English have at length been made out with sufficient accuracy (Sievers, Zur Rhythmik des Germanischen Alliterationsverses, in Paul und Braune's Beiträge, Bd. X), and have been applied to our poem by Karl Luick (Paul und Braune's Beiträge, XI 470–492 ; cf. my new edition of Judith, pp. lv–lxxi). Assuming that these are well known, I will at once proceed to record the metrical observations on the Northumbrianized version of Judith, which may be easily verified by any student for himself.

1. In the vast majority of hemistichs the metre remains entirely unchanged.

2. The metrical necessity for the syncope of middle vowels in the cases established by Sievers (PB. X 459 ff.) is fully confirmed by many instances in our version. Thus, éadgo, 35[a]; módga, 52[b];

[1] The text of the Northumbrian version accompanied this paper, but, to save space, is omitted here. It may be readily found by referring to the second revised and enlarged edition of the Judith, published by D. C. Heath & Co., Boston.

Digitized by Google

hálge, 56[b]; hæðna, 98[b]; hæðna, 110[a]; hálga, 160[b]; hæðnes, 179[a]; hálga, 203[b].

3. In other instances the metre is rendered more regular by the substitution of vowels long by position for the short vowels of the manuscript; in other words, a proper iambic, trochaic, dactylic, or other rhythm, with a long vowel to bear the ictus, takes the place of a kind of logaœdic rhythm, in which two short vowels stand, by resolution, in the place of the single long one. Thus, for example, snotra (snottra?), 55[a], becomes a trochee; beadw-, 175[b], becomes, instead of beadu-, the end of a foot anapæstic in its general character; níol-, 113[a], becomes the long syllable of an anapæst; salwig-, 211[a], becomes a trochee; beadwe, 213[a], cwicra, 235[a], 324[a], -frætwad, 329[b], -feðra, 210[b], are all trochees. The loss of the final *e* in the first element of certain compounds has a similar effect: thus hyg-, 131[a], becomes a monosyllabic foot, and sig-, 295[a], the long syllable of an anapæst. In like manner, the first syllable of hęrpað, 303[b], in the ordinary version, must be considered as long by Sweet, who otherwise would naturally have emended it to hęre-, as phonological law has required in the Northumbrian version. Another example of hyg- is found in 303[a], where it forms the first syllable of a foot having the form ⌿ ⌣ ×. Hypesæx, 328[a], is doubtful; perhaps hup- should remain.

4. The dropping of final *e* in the pronouns hir and ðǽr has a similar effect upon the metre. Feet are shortened, with advantage to the regularity of the metre, in 99[b], 123[b], 124[b], 130[b], 149[a], 149[b], 167[a], 175[b], 286[b], 327[a], 335[b], 341[b]; in the anacrusis, 5[b]. Hir appears to be sometimes long, and sometimes short; it is long in 5[b], 99[b], 335[b], short in 123[b], 130[b], 149[a], 175[a].

5. The change in the form of a verb converts a trochee to a cyclic dactyl in 9[a], 11[a], a first pæon to a dactyl in 278[a], and increases the number of unstressed syllables by one in the first foot of 117[b]: ne ðorfeð hé hopiga nó, like Beów. 392 (PB. X 239), ðæt hé éower æðelu can, and Beów. 1213, héo fore ðǽm werede spræc.

6. In 324[b] and 325[b], an anapæst followed by an iambus becomes anapæst + anapæst, which is a common form (PB. X 240).

7. The substitution of plur. flondas for fýnd does not seem to cause a transgression of metrical law. Thus, in 320[b], flondas oferwunnen resembles the cases under 11 in PB. X 230, and stands or falls with them; flondas sindon luera, 195[b], would be admissible on the same terms, were it not that luera is a trisyllable; but perhaps we should be justified in reading lura.

Digitized by Google

8. In one instance, double trochee changes to the type ⌿ × | ⌿ ⌣ ×: bord and brád swordas, 318ᵃ. Whether scírméled swordas, 230ᵇ, of the form ⌿ ⌣ × | ⌿ ×, can be allowed to stand, I leave for others to determine; it is found exceptionally in the first hemistich (PB. X 310), but apparently not in the second.

9. The rime is often unaffected by the phonetic changes undergone by both riming words. Thus hiorde : gestíorde is as good a rime as hyrde : gestýrde, 60; so néasa : forléasa, 63. In other cases the rime is actually improved, as in -ræste : -hlæste, 36; flég- : fég-, 47; swíra : swíma, 106. In line 2 the conversion of funde to fand destroys the rime, but of this we shall speak under a subsequent head.

10. Hiatus is more frequent, through the loss of final *n*, though this is a matter of no importance in Old English prosody. Examples occur in 15ᵇ, 18ᵇ, 42ᵇ, 64ᵃ, 114ᵇ, 120ᵇ, 154ᵃ, 243ᵃ, 348ᵃ.

11. Alliteration is destroyed by the substitution of geéad for gegán in lines 140 and 219. Could Northumbrian poetry have had its peculiar form, differing from that of prose?

12. Metre is apparently destroyed in three cases, 132ᵇ, 135ᵇ, and 272ᵃ. A stressed short syllable is inadmissible in ðǫna and hęre of the final foot, and similarly the first syllable of ðolende should be long. We may conceive of the latter as possible by means of secondary lengthening, but ðǫna and hęre can only be emended for metrical purposes in the manner actually adopted by the manuscript text. Hęrige could easily be restored in the Northumbrian version on the analogy of other forms (cf. l. 294), but ðanonne (ðanone, ðǫnane) must have been coined for prosodical reasons. One is inclined to assume a similar coinage or adaptation in the case of funde (9, above). Trué, it is common in West Saxon prose (Cosijn, Altwestschsische Grammatik, II § 84), yet its adoption may have been determined or influenced by poetic considerations in the first place. As it stands, this line is hopelessly unmetrical, and could not be restored except by replacing funde.

Digitized by Google

V. — *Notes on the Vocalism of Late West Saxon.*

By ALBERT S. COOK,

PROFESSOR IN YALE UNIVERSITY.

THE phonological study of Ælfric's Homilies, recently made by my friend and pupil, Mr. Frank Fischer, has rendered it somewhat easier to survey the vocalism of the most important of Late West Saxon authors. As this paper has not been fully published at the date of the present writing (it is included in No. 2, Vol. IV of the Publications of the Modern Language Association), a synopsis of the chief results of the investigation may be welcome. This synopsis will accordingly be presented in the most summary form, with references, whenever necessary, to the Sievers-Cook Old English Grammar, second edition.

1. Where EWS. sometimes has *a* before *l* + cons., Ælfric always has the breaking *ea*.

2. Where EWS. fluctuates between *a* and *o* before nasals (Gr. 65), Ælfric always has *a*.

3. The umlaut variation in the past participle of certain strong verbs (Gr. 50. 2) is not found in Ælfric. In these cases the vowel is always *a*.

4. Ecthlipsis of *g*, with lengthening of the preceding vowel, takes place wherever possible before *d*, ð, and *n* (Gr. 214. 3 and Note 3).

5. Palatal *g* shows a similar tendency toward vocalization and disappearance in such forms as dæig-, læig, mæig, mæigð, cǽig, mǽig-, mǽið, ǽig, weig, seigð.

6. In Ælfric there are no *ie*, *ie*, *io*, *io*, *æ*, *ǽ*.

7. In 25 words of the Homilies, Vol. 1, *i* occurs for *y*, the *i*-umlaut of *u*, chiefly before palatals and nasal combinations. In 9 stems *í* occurs for *ý*, the *i*-umlaut of *ú*.

8. EWS. *ie* (from various sources) is represented in Ælfric now by *i*, now by *y*, with a decided preponderance in favor of *y*. Exceptional are cwelm- 72. 11, eltsta 24. 7, gerela 296. 4, gest- 30. 14, -welm 382. 13.

9. EWS. *ie* is similarly represented by *í* and *ý*, with a like preponderance in favor of *ý*. Exceptions are few in favor of *é*, 6 in all.

Digitized by Google

10. Palatal umlaut is common, but that by a preceding palatal has been noted only in the word scép, for scéap.

11. The influence of *w* upon following *eo, io* is noticeable, producing *u, y*.

12. *U*-umlaut fails to occur in metod, werod.

13. Secondary lengthening of all the vowels is frequent, if Thorpe's edition is to be trusted.

14. Peculiar or exceptional forms are : næcednysse 392. 8; lichomlice 142. 7, dæghwomlice 408. 6, ungesome 478. 25, womm 236. 31; ardlice 78. 19; galdrum 474. 21; gewarnast 6. 28; ymesene 418. 22; embe 36. 10, ymbrene (for -ryne) 102. 27; fir 132. 25; hréaw 380. 34; sinu (sina) 236. 21; cynnestran 352. 27, understynt 158. 35; bewýpð 84. 29; wælhréaw 606. 1; always hraðe, never hræðe. Besides, there is a large number of more or less completely Anglicized Latin words, of which aspide 486. 35, Chaldeisc 570. 10, manna 76. 16, cherubim 10. 14, Ebreisc 24. 11, Perscisc 518. 17, Medas 454. 12, Judeisc 48. 19, cyrographum 300. 5 are not found in the index to Pogatscher's Lautlehre der Griechischen, Lateinischen und Romanischen Lehnworte im Altenglischen (Strassburg and London, 1888).

Many other interesting particulars, together with the full proof of the statements here made, may be found in the monograph itself, which is therefore heartily recommended to professional students of Old English.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

I. Proceedings of Twenty-First Annual Session, Easton, Pa., 1889.

II. Treasurer's Report (p. iv).

III. List of Officers and Members (p. xlix).

IV. Constitution of the Association (p. lxi).

V. Publications of the Association (p. lxiii).

VI. Indices to Vols. I–XX.

Digitized by Google

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL SESSION (EASTON).

Herbert L. Baker, Detroit, Mich.
Isbon T. Beckwith, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
P. M. Biklé, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
Edward B. Clapp, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.
Manuel J. Drennan, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
A. Gudeman, New York, N. Y.
Isaac H. Hall, Metropolitan Museum, New York, N. Y.
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Edward W. Hopkins, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Theodore W. Hunt, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
George B. Hussey, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
Edmund Morris Hyde, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa.
John B. Kieffer, Lancaster, Pa.
Charles S. Knox, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Francis A. March, Jr., Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Samuel A. Martin, Lincoln University, Pa.
W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
James M. Paton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Tracy Peck, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Edward E. Phillips, Marietta College, Marietta, O.
Thomas R. Price, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Sylvester Primer, Friends' School, Providence, R. I.
Julius Sachs, New York, N. Y.
W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.
C. P. G. Scott, New York, N. Y.
Thomas D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
William D. Shipman, Buchtel College, Akron, O.
M. S. Slaughter, Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.
Clement Lawrence Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Herbert Weir Smyth, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Edward Snyder, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.
J. R. S. Sterrett, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.
Edward F. Stewart, Easton, Pa.
Morris H. Stratton, Salem, N. J.
Andrew F. West, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

[Total, 38.]

Digitized by Google

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

EASTON, PA., Tuesday, July 9, 1889.

THE Twenty-First Annual Session was called to order at 4 P.M., in Room 5, Pardee Hall, Lafayette College, by Professor Thomas D. Seymour, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn., President of the Association.

The Secretary, Professor John H. Wright, presented the following report of the Executive Committee: —

a. The Committee had elected as members of the Association:[1] —

Charles W. Bain, Portsmouth, Va.
Herbert L. Baker, Detroit, Mich.
Charles W. Ballard, New York, N. Y.
P. M. Biklé, Professor in Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
Edward Capps, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
James C. Egbert, Instructor in Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Edwin W. Fay, Fellow of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Abraham L. Fuller, Instructor in Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
George P. Garrison, Professor of English, Austin, Tex.
A. Gudeman, Ph. D., New York, N. Y.
J. Leslie Hall, Professor of English, William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.
Benjamin F. Harding, Belmont School, Cambridge, Mass.
Lawrence C. Hull, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
John B. Kieffer, Professor in Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
Charles Sigourney Knox, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
Clifford H. Moore, Oakland, Cal.
Charles A. Moore, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Ransom Norton, Houlton, Me.
Rev. Endicott Peabody, Groton School, Groton, Mass.
Edwin M. Pickop, High School, Hartford, Conn.
George Rodeman, Ph. D., Cambridge, Mass.
T. F. Sanford, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Henry A. Scribner, Plainfield, N. J.
Albert H. Smyth, Philadelphia, Pa.

[1] In this list are included the names of all persons elected to membership at the Twenty-First Annual Session of the Association. The addresses given are, as far as can be, those of the autumn of 1889.

Digitized by Google

F. C. Sumichrast, Assistant Professor of French, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Fitz Gerald Tisdall, Professor of Greek, College of the City of New York, N. Y.
H. C. Tolman, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
J. W. H. Walden, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Hamilton Wallace, Principal Public High School, Tulare, Cal.
Sarah E. Wright, Augusta Seminary, Staunton, Va.
A. C. Zenos, Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

b. The Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Session (Amherst) were to be issued in the course of the meeting; the Transactions for the same year (Vol. XIX.) would be issued in a few weeks.

c. The Committee had voted to give copies of the Transactions of the Association to the Smithsonian Institution and to the American School of Athens, as well as to the institutions named on pp. 1, li., of the Proceedings for 1888.

Professor Wright presented also his report as Treasurer of the Association for the year ending July 6, 1889. The summary of accounts for 1888–89 is as follows: —

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, July 7, 1888		$487.19
Fees, assessments, and arrears paid in	$918.25	
Sales of Transactions and of Reprints	216.59	
Total receipts for the year		1134.84
		$1622.03

EXPENDITURES.

For Transactions (Vol. XVIII.) and Proceedings for 1887: composition, printing, distribution	$760.41	
For postages, stationary, job printing, clerk hire	75.00	
Interest on borrowed money ($200) with partial payment ($12.20 + $50)	62.20	
Total expenditures for the year		$897.61
Balance on hand, July 6, 1889		724.42
		$1622.03

The Association owes the Treasurer $200, the debt of $250 of July 7, 1889, having been reduced by the payment of $50, Nov. 1, 1888.

The Chair appointed as Committee to audit the Treasurer's report, Messrs. Isaac H. Hall and H. W. Smyth.

At 4.20 P.M. the reading of papers was begun. At this time there were about thirty persons present; at the subsequent meetings the number averaged forty-five.

Digitized by Google

1. Notes on Andocides, by Professor W. S. Scarborough, of Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.

The Mss. and editions of Andocides now extant are the same as those of the orator Antiphon with the omission of the Oxford (N) which makes no mention of this orator. Or as Blass[1] puts it: —

"Andocidis codices eosdem fere atque Antiphontis habemus praeterquam quod Oxoniensis N ope in hoc oratore destituti sumus."

Both of these orators have come down to us together, and the defects and corruptions which they have in common indicate that they are derived from a common archetype. The bibliographical observations made in respect to the one are almost equally applicable to the other.

It is generally conceded that the Crippsianus (A) is the most accurate, and therefore the best Ms. that we have of Andocides. Bekker used this as the basis of his text. He also collated the Laurentian (B), the Marcian (L), and a Breslau copy. Then he further examined the Ambrosian (P) and the Burneian (M). As to the Ambrosian (Q) and in respect to its bearing upon the Andocidean orations, vide Blass, etc. (Teubner). Baiter, Bekker, Blass, and Sauppe have, perhaps, given us the best texts; while Meier, Hirschigg, Kirchoff, Vater, Stephen, Reiske, Dobson, Sluiter, Dobree, Valckenaer, Bergk, Klotz, Maetzner, and others have thrown much light upon various points in the text.

Immanuel Bekker has done especial service to scholars by his remarkably clear and complete recension of the Andocidean orations. Aldus gave us the first complete edition, though full of errors. Bekker, Dobree, and Schiller followed with others in emending and correcting the Aldine edition. The Zurich edition was represented by Baiter and Sauppe who were not less vigilant than others of their contemporaries in their efforts to furnish a faultless text. I regard the edition of Blass the most available text that we have. It is certainly one of the best recensions of that orator to be found in the libraries of Europe, aside perhaps from a few orthographical forms observed here and there, which are probably foreign to the age of Andocides. Blass uses σῴζω with ι subscript and defends it with the remark: "Scribere dum esse in vulgus notum est contra ἐσώθην σωτηρία." Curtius, in his Das Verbum der Grieschischen Sprache seinem Baue nach dargestellt, discusses with numerous examples the two forms σῴζω, σώζω, and seems to favor the latter. In the Etymologicum Magnum I observe the following: Ἀλλ' ἡ παράδοσις ἔχει τὸ ι. τὸ δὲ σῴζω, ὅτε μὲν γίνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ σῶος σωΐζω ὡς λέπος λεπίζω καὶ κατὰ συναίρεσιν σῴζω ἔχει τὸ ι. ἡνίκα δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ σάος σαόζω καὶ κράσει σώζω, οὐκ ἔχει προσγεγραμμένον τὸ ι (p. 741. 25). — That is to say that σώζω has the ι subscript when derived from σῶος and that σωΐζω becomes by synæresis (συναίρεσις) σῴζω, just as λεπίζω is from λέπος; further, that σαόζω is derived from σάος and does not take the iota, but becomes by crasis (κράσις) σώζω. Neither this nor the explanation of Buttman[2] is conclusive, though the appearance of the ι subscript form is fully established by Attic inscriptions of an early date — and yet I am of the opinion that σώζω is more classic than σῴζω. Dr. Smyth, however, calls my attention to the fact that σώζω does not appear upon Attic inscriptions till after 100 B.C.

[1] Preface to his Ed. (Teubner), p. iii.

[2] Ausführliche Griechische Sprachlehre, II. 295.

Digitized by Google

The style of Andocides is peculiar. Aside from the frequent repetition of the same thought there is a loose connection of sentences; the tendency to change abruptly his construction, by the introduction of new clauses and then to resume his narrative with δὲ οὗτος, or οὗτος δὲ (vide Myst. 1, 2, 27, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70–73, 80–81, 137–139, 140–145, etc., etc.; De Red. 3, etc.; De Pace 5, 34, etc., etc.) Blass, in his edition, uses εἵνεκα for ἕνεκα. εἵνεκα is a form not generally found in the tragic poets, nor in the best Attic prose, though it occurs in Plato, also in Demosthenes, and in the Antiphontic Tetral., B, β, 10. Wecklein and Weil admit the form in their editions of Æschylus, vide Wackernagel, K. Z. XXVIII, 109 ff. It is not allowable in the tragic poets, nor is it admissible in the best Attic prose. Between μὴ θέλοντας and μὴ 'θέλοντας, Greek usage compels us to adopt the shorter form, though Baiter and Sauppe write the longer. "ἐθέλω is found upon all Attic inscriptions till the year 300 B.C.; after 200 B.C. θέλω comes to light." — Blass has bracketed the dative after κελεύω (vide Myst. 11). A similar construction appears in § 40 (Myst.). The dative is never thus used in the best Attic prose. — Again I note the use of an enclitic form of the pronoun after the preposition, as in the phrase πρός με (λέγει πρός με Χαρμίδης). This is certainly contrary to the general rule as the following examples will show: ἐπ' ἐμοί, Xen. Oecon. VII. 14; κατ' ἐμέ, Id. II. 9; παρ' ἐμοί, Id. XI. 9; περὶ ἐμοῦ, Id. II. 15; ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, Id. VII. 3. For other examples, vide Dem. Cor., Hdt., etc. — In the phrase τότε δὴ προσιὼν Λυσίστρατον we have an unusual example of a *personal object* after προσιέναι. Cf. Xen. Mem. I. 2, 47.

Another queer construction is found in the use of τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ for τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον — the dative for the modal acc.; vide Aristoph., Plato, etc. There are many other debatable forms found in some of the editions of the Andocidean orations — some interpolations, others a part of the original narrative. Andocides was largely inclined to the use of circumlocutions and ambiguities, and there is need of caution on the part of critics in their attempt to separate the genuine from the spurious. As to the Κατ' Ἀλκιβιάδου, whether Andocides was the author or not, there is much discussion. Yet the similarity of style, the numerous periods ending in anacolutha, etc., etc., aside from the historical inaccuracies, would indicate that he was the author of the oration against Alcibiades.

Remarks were made by Messrs. E. W. Hopkins, T. D. Seymour, J. H. Wright, and H. W. Smyth.

2. Maximus Planudes: his Life and Works, by Dr. A. Gudeman, of New York, N.Y.

The all but universally accepted verdict of condemnation which has been passed upon Byzantine scholarship, however just it may be found to have been in numerous instances, has undoubtedly been the chief cause of blinding the eyes of philologists to the distinguished merits of at least one of the scholars of that time, the monk Maximus Planudes. This verdict reached, as it demonstrably was, upon altogether insufficient evidence and upon sweeping generalizations, due in a great measure, to a lack of historical perspective, naturally not only precluded any accurate criticism, but decidedly discouraged renewed impartial investigations.

Digitized by Google

The ambitious aim of this paper, of which the following is but a very short abstract,[1] is to replace traditional prejudices and errors by facts; to give an accurate and detailed account of Planudes' life, and by a complete critical survey of his writings, to pave the way for a juster appreciation of this monk's services to classical philology.

Right at the very outset of our inquiry, we must enter upon a detailed discussion of the traditional data in Planudes' life which, though singularly erroneous, have nevertheless been accepted, without question, as true, for the last three hundred years; his ἀκμή being generally assigned to the year 1353 (I know not on what grounds), and the date of his diplomatic mission to Venice to the year 1327. The original source of this piece of chronological information seems to have been *Raphael Maffeus Volaterra's* (1451–1521) Commentarii Urbani, lib. XVII.[2] The data just given subsequently passed into Lambecius' Catalogue of the library of Vienna and into Fabricius' famous Bibliotheca Graeca, and from this time on were never called into question, until in 1877 Maximilian Treu conclusively proved them wrong.[3] But Treu's discovery remaining practically unknown, whether we ascribe this fact to the strange vitality so characteristic of error, or to the inaccessibility of his little pamphlet, the author of this paper thought himself justified in again taking up Treu's convincing arguments in his thesis,[4] adding such corroborative evidence as the then still unpublished letters of Planudes happily supplied him with.[5]

This short abstract will, of course, not admit of more than the very briefest review of the arguments, by which the traditional chronology has been shown to be altogether untenable.

There is an epigram extant (p. 65, of my dissertation) composed by one *Gregorius*.[6] It consists of twenty-two rather uncouth hexameter and pentameter verses, and deeply deplores the death of Maximus Planudes, as an irretrievable loss to his country. His works, some of which the writer enumerates, are pronounced to be of so great a value, as to entitle their lamented author to a glorious immortality. The "poem" does not add anything to our previous knowledge of Planudes, with the very important exception of the seventh line, which reads as follows: —

Πέμπτην ἐξανύων ἐτέων δεκάδ' ἐσθ' ἄκρα μούσης

We are here told, on the unimpeachable testimony of an intimate friend, that Planudes did not much exceed the age of fifty. With this fact we combine another.

[1] The entire paper will be published in the American Journal of Philology.

[2] It is true, Volaterra asks his readers to consult Bessarion for the data given by him. I have, however, been unable to find the slightest trace of the statement referred to in the published works of the famous cardinal, although he speaks of Planudes repeatedly.

[3] Cf. M. Treu Gymnasial Prog. Waldenburg, i/Schl. 1877 ("Zu Plutarch's Moralia").

[4] A. Gudeman De Heroidum Ovidii codice Planudeo, Berolini, 1888, Calvary & Co. (p. 67 sqq.).

[5] The letters, one hundred and twenty-two in number, have now been published by Treu in successive programmes of the Friedrichs Gymnasium of Breslau; cf. especially the programme of 1889, p. 183 sqq.

[6] Perhaps identical with the friend addressed in Planudes' 25, 26, and 27 letters.

Digitized by Google

There is preserved in the library of Venice a manuscript in Planudes' own handwriting, containing the Gospel of St. John, from the subscription of which we learn of its being completed in September, 1302. Now assuming the traditional chronology which assigns his *floruit* to the year 1353 to be correct, Planudes must have been about two years old at the time, when he finished the copy of the Gospel of St. John, an example of precocity, surely as unprecedented as it is absurd!

Nor does the year 1327, given as the date of the embassy, fare any better, for it can be conclusively proven from a passage in Pachymeres and from Planudes' own correspondence (cf. p. 69 sqq. of my dissertation) that he left for Venice in the company of Leon Orphanotrophos in the winter of 1296, being then, to use Pachymeres' own words, an *ἀνὴρ ἐλλόγιμος καὶ συνετός*. Combining all these facts, we arrive at the following chronological data: Planudes was born about 1250–1260, and was sent as an embassador to the Venetian Republic in 1296. He copied the Gospel of St. John in *September*, 1302, and having not much exceeded the age of fifty, he cannot well have died later than 1310, though possibly earlier.

Planudes was born in Nicomedia, as he tells us himself in the prooemium to his "Encomium in sanctum megalomartyrem Diomedem."[1] He left his native town at an early age for Constantinople, for in Ep. 112, 40, he describes a triumphal procession,[2] commemorating a great victory over the Persians which occurred in 1282. On taking orders, he discarded his baptismal name Manuel for that of Maximus.[3] He soon became involved in the ecclesiastical controversies between the Greek and Latin churches, concerning the momentous question of the emanation of the Holy Ghost, and it was in support of the shrewd ecclesiastical policy of Michael Palaeologus that he probably translated St. Augustin's De trinitate, but on the accession to the throne of Andronicus II., who completely reversed his father's policy, Planudes returned to the orthodox Greek faith, whether on compulsion or not is not clear, by writing four syllogisms (still extant), "de processione Spiriti Sancti contra Latinos." His correspondence shows him to have been on intimate terms with the emperor himself as well as with most of the highest officials of the empire. Omitting minor biographical details, I proceed to enumerate some of the more important of Planudes' works,[4] having to content myself in this place with a mere skeleton outline of the subjects treated of.

1. *Anthologia Planudea.*

   Its critical value. To be judged solely by the standard of scholarship of the period.

2. *Ms. copy of the works of Plutarch.* Cf. Ep. 106.

   "Ἐμοὶ δ' ἔδοξε τὰ τοῦ Πλουτάρχου γράψαι βίβλια· πανύ γὰρ οἶσθα τὸν ἄνδρα φιλῶ· δεῖ τοίνυν ἔχειν μεμβράνας·"

[1] Cf. Boissonade ad Ovidii Metam., pag. XII. and Treu l.c. (1889), p. 191.

[2] "ὃν καὶ αὐτὸς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐδεξάμην, περιφανέστατον τῶν πώποτε φδομένων θριάμβων." This letter, together with about twenty-six others, is addressed to the famous General Philanthropenus.

[3] On this custom, cf. Treu, l.c. p. 189. The forty-seven verses composed by him "In laudem Ptolomaei" must therefore have been written prior to this time, for the twenty-seventh line reads as follows: ὃς ῥα Μανουὴλ οὔνομ' ἔχων λέγομ' ἠδὲ Πλανούδης.

[4] Planudes' theological works were not discussed in this paper.

Digitized by Google

3. *Life of Aesop* attributed to Planudes. Cf. Bentley Dissert. on Epist. of Phalaris, etc., p. 578 W.
   Proof of its spuriousness, from its matter and its style.

4. *Rhetorical and grammatical treatises.*
   Especially the Prolegomena to Hermogenes (Rhet. Gr. vol. 5. W.). Their value. Compared to other works of a similar nature.

5. *His mathematical treatises.*
   The Ψηφοφορία κατ' Ἴνδους, etc. Planudes' services to mathematics hitherto overlooked. An attempt to do him justice. Cf. Ep. 35, 46, 67, 100 sqq. *et saepius.*

6. *His correspondence* (122 Epistles — not edited by himself. Earliest, written about 1282; latest, 1299 (1300?). His personal character.

7. *Translations of Latin into Greek.*
   A review of Greek translations from Latin authors before Planudes (Zenobius' Sallust [cf. Suidas], Capito's and Paeanius' Eutropius). Reasons why the Greeks so seldom translated Latin authors into their own tongue. Planudes, the first to do this to any extent, thus opening a new field in Greek literature. The originality and importance of this step hitherto not recognized.

a. *Boethii De consolatione philosophiae.*
   Planudes' masterpiece. Proof that it was written before 1295.

b. *Caesaris de Bello Gallico, VII books.*
   Next in order of merit. Its value for purposes of text criticism. Formerly attributed to Theodorus Gaza, together with the Somnium Scipionis. A conjecture concerning the possible cause of these works being attributed to Gaza.

c. *Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis.*
   The Saturnalia of Macrobius not translated by Planudes. Error of Bentley, Fabricius, etc.

d. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, lib. III. (de memoria).

e. *Disticha Catonis.*
   Probably his earliest effort as a translator. Compared with Scaliger's Greek version of the same.

f. *Metamorphoses of Ovid.*
   A work of no critical value, but one involving much time and labor.

h. *Heroides of Ovid.*
   Its great critical value. Cf. A. Gudeman, De Heroidum Ovidii codice Planudeo, 1888, Calvary & Co., Berlin (90 pp.).

i. *Translations falsely attributed to Planudes.*
   Boethii De dialectis, Boethii Commentaria in Topica Ciceronis, Augustinus De civitate dei, etc.

8. *Works known to have been written by Planudes, though no longer extant,* Περὶ μουσικῆς (cf. Ep. 64, 25) and others.

9. *Excerpta Dionis, Comparatio hiemis et veris, Medical treatises, etc.*

Scientific character of Planudes. Great learning, indefatigable industry, astounding versatility, and an undying devotion to classical studies. Not an original thinker. His scholarship compared with that of his contemporaries of a superior kind.

Digitized by Google

The paper closes with a plea for the reversal of the unfavorable judgment which scholars have so long and so unanimously passed upon the life-work of this diligent and learned Byzantine monk.

The Chair appointed as Committee to Nominate Officers for 1889–90, Messrs. I. T. Beckwith, L. H. Elwell, and E. W. Hopkins.

The Committee to propose Time and Place for the next meeting was also appointed: Messrs. T. Peck, J. Sachs, and J. M. Paton.

At 6 P.M. the Association adjourned to meet at 8 o'clock.

EASTON, PA., July 9, 1889.

EVENING SESSION.

The Association with many residents of Easton assembled in the Auditorium of Pardee Hall at 8 P.M.

The programme of papers for the remainder of the session, as arranged by the Executive Committee, was then read by the Secretary.

Rev. James H. Mason Knox, President of Lafayette College, welcomed the Association to Easton in an appropriate address.

The audience then listened to the annual address of the President of the Association.

3. Philological Study in America, by Professor Thomas D. Seymour, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

After congratulating the Association on the auspicious opening of its twenty-first annual meeting, and mentioning briefly the names and services of the prominent philologists who have died during the past year, the speaker gave a survey of the work of the Association and of the course and development of philological study in this country.

This Association has amply justified its existence. The value of its work is not to be measured by its volumes of Transactions and Proceedings, nor by the formal discussions at its meetings. Not a few new and true philological principles have been enunciated and explained before this body. Excellent philological work has been stimulated by the audience which this Association offers. But, after all, the main service of the society is that which the name *Association* implies. Few have departed from these gatherings without the impulse to broader and deeper research. No other science is so far removed as philology from the work and thought of the ordinary man. No other men of science have so much need as ourselves of association and union.

This Association was founded on a comprehensive plan, and some of its difficulties and dangers have arisen from its comprehensiveness. Its founders hoped that it could be divided into sections, and seven different departments were named, but the numbers actually present at its meetings have not justified such a division.

Digitized by Google

The true Alexandrine idea of philology was adopted at the first, — embracing literary criticism and archaeological illustration, as well as linguistic science. The Association includes also paedagogy in the broadest sense, though not in technicalities. The condition of philological study in this country requires that most of us should direct our efforts to the presentation of philological facts and principles to our classes quite as much as to the discovery of new philological truths. The first duty of most is to teach well, — *i.e.* to know their subject, and to set it forth in an accurate, intelligible, attractive, and impressive form, avoiding unnecessary matter and insoluble problems. But the second commandment, which is like unto the first, is to pursue philological study for its own sake. It is a blessing to our science in America that the few who are most conspicuous for their attainments and discoveries, are also conspicuous for their paedagogical skill, and are brilliant examples to the rest of us.

The course of philology in America has changed greatly during these last twenty years. When this Association was founded, Professor Whitney was almost alone in delving in the mine of Sanscrit, Professor March and Professor Child had few companions in their work in English philology, the security from control of our leader in the study of the Indian languages was almost a common jest, the very idea of a comparative Semitic Philology was hardly formed, while the Teutonic and Romance Philologies were seeking for recognition.

Twenty years ago, the tendency of philology in America was distinctly towards linguistics. The pendulum swung too far, perhaps, in that direction. The present tendency seems possibly too far away from linguistics, and toward art and archaeology. The same change is seen in the classical instruction of our country. Less attention is paid to the analysis of words, and their relation as cognate or derived. Far more is taught of ancient life and culture. The results of recent archaeological study are presented to our classes. Some of us, indeed, seem in imminent danger of making Greek philology a branch of political science. Etymology and linguistics at one time threatened to claim the sole right to the name of philology, but now a large proportion of classical philologists are turning to the study of inscriptions, vases, and sculpture, as illustrative of ancient life and literature. A multitude of hidden facts will be drawn from the literature itself. This is all well. The study of classical philology must be made as interesting and animated as possible, and the connection of our own life and civilization with that of the ancient Greeks and Romans is so close as to make the acquaintance with this at first hand of high value to every educated man. But classical philology must not become classical archaeology.

If any one desires comfort for the present, and encouragement for the future, of philological study in this country, let him survey the progress of this science in America during the past century. Philology is not an old science here. Our forefathers were too busy in founding a free nation to give much room to literature and art, whether of their own or ancient times. For the first century and more of her existence, Harvard College required for admission no knowledge of Greek beyond the inflexion of nouns and verbs, and in 1800 only about as much Greek was read in college as is now read in the best "fitting-schools." No Greek but the New Testament seems to have been studied in the regular course at Yale College until after the beginning of the nineteenth century. Latin studies were in a somewhat better plight than Greek, since Latin was the scholastic language. The text-books

Digitized by Google

used in the study of the classics were weak and barren, affording little help to the beginner and none to the more advanced student. The best college libraries had no decent collection of even the classical texts. The Yale library had long possessed a copy of Stephens's Greek Thesaurus (as the gift of Sir Isaac Newton), and copies of the works of Plato and the Platonists (as the gift of Bishop Berkeley), but in 1800 had no copy of Aeschylus and no Greek orators but Demosthenes and Aeschines. Very few even of the old "variorum" editions seem to have found their way to this country in the eighteenth century. The first great change in the teaching of languages at Yale College was due to the election in 1805 of James Luce Kingsley to the chair of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. (As if the duties of this office were insufficient, Professor Kingsley gave instruction also in Church History.) Mr. Kingsley was not a great scholar according to modern standards, but he was an elegant latinist with a strong and keen linguistic sense, and soon broadened the classical course.

Just before 1820, three young Americans whose names are very familiar in other connections, studied philology in Germany, — Edward Everett, George Ticknor, and George Bancroft. Of these, two were drawn aside into political and historical studies, while Ticknor devoted himself to Spanish literature. Everett gave little instruction and seems to have had slight influence on Greek study, except what was due to his translation of Buttmann's smaller grammar, and his edition of Jacobs' Greek Reader. Bancroft translated Heeren's Researches on Ancient Greece.

Only three or four years after the return of Everett, Ticknor, and Bancroft, Theodore Dwight Woolsey went to Europe and spent three years in the study of Greek. On his return, he was elected to the chair of Greek in Yale College, and entered upon the duties of his professorship in 1831. For twenty years (including the first five of his presidency of the college) he devoted the powers of his great mind to the service of philology. He soon broadened and deepened the course of Greek instruction at Yale and exerted a strong influence on classical teaching elsewhere. His influence has been fitly compared to that of Erasmus at Rotterdam. The editions of Greek works which he prepared and modestly designated as "for the use of American colleges," were admirable when compared with similar English, French, or German editions of that time, and opened a new field for American scholarship.

Certainly, during the first half of this century, no one else was so clearly the leader of philological study in this country as Woolsey, whose mortal remains were laid to rest only four days ago. He secured the best classical library in America, and was thoroughly possessed of the best English and German methods of his time. His mind was thoroughly scientific by nature, besides being acute and virile. If he too had not been drawn away from philology in the strength of his manhood, we may be sure that the world would know Woolsey as a philologist, as it now knows him as an administrator and publicist.

During the lifetime of this Association, the growing importance of the younger departments of our science has secured for them an honored place where they existed before only by sufferance or as ornamental studies. The advance of the old natural sciences, on the other hand, and the development of others of which nothing was known a few years ago, have crowded hard upon the traditional studies of our colleges. But in our larger institutions, many studies are now made optional

Digitized by Google

or elective, and a student who desires to pursue philological courses can give more time to this pursuit, and can make considerable attainments while still an undergraduate. This has led philological teachers to offer more advanced courses and a larger variety. Dozens do now what only a remarkable individual here and there attempted thirty years ago.

Simply to register the most important philological books of the last twenty years would be a considerable task. The student of to-day would feel helpless without the works of these last years.

In our own land, besides the yearly volume of Transactions of this Association, our sister association publishes Modern Language Notes, the American Journal of Philology has reached its tenth volume, and the American Journal of Archaeology its fifth volume; Hebraica represents with credit and energy Semitic Studies; the Classical Review has been introduced into the midst of us; the Universities of Cornell, Nebraska, and Texas (the oldest of which is hardly older than this Association) have published valuable Philological Studies; the American Institute of Archaeology has published accounts of its explorations in Mexico and its excavations in Asia Minor; while the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (may we call it the *filia pulchrior* of the Institute of Archaeology?) has published four volumes of Papers.

No one here would think or allow that any branch of philology is effete; that its growth is checked and its powers exhausted; that only a scanty gleaning of facts and principles remains for us and our successors. We all feel that the fresh strength of any department of our science is sure to bring new vigor to all the rest. The tie which binds us is stronger than it seems. We have much in common, and we all may profit by union. Let us trust that the growth of the future will be as rapid and as sound as that of the past, and that we may always find a rallying point for learning and for free discussion in the meetings of this Association.

At the close of the address, the Association adjourned to 9 A.M. Wednesday.

EASTON, PA., July 10, 1889.

The Association was called to order at 9.15 A.M. by Professor T. D. Seymour, the President.

The Association was invited, on behalf of the Committee on Entertainment, to make at 3.30 P.M. an excursion to Paxinosa Inn, where dinner would be served and a reception held in the evening.

The invitation was accepted, and it was determined to adjourn at 12 M. and to hold a second session from 1.30 P.M. to 3.30 P.M.

The reading of communications was then resumed.

4. The Meter of Milton's Paradise Lost, by Professor Francis A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

The first book of Paradise Lost is perhaps the most perfect production of metrical art. A complete digest of its meter wil giv a good idea of Milton's blank verse.

Digitized by Google

Each verse is made up of five feet of equal times. It is also made up of two or more great divisions or sections. Milton himself lays stress, as a part of musical delight, upon having "the sense variously drawn out from one verse into another," i.e. on the management of the verse caesura.

He has seven familiar places for the caesura: after each foot but the last, and in the midl of the second, third, and fourth. Two often occur in the same verse. In the whole book their number is as follows: —

First foot.		Second foot.		Third foot.		Fourth foot.		Fifth foot.
Midl.	End.	Midl.	End.	Midl.	End.	Midl.	End.	Midl.
4	35	77	161	166	196	108	33	5

It is by tracing the movement of the caesura from verse to verse that its musical effect is obtaind. The curv is a veritabl line of beuty; the point of division sways with the movement of the thought like the index on the power gage of the dynamo as the cars move up and down the slopes of an electric road.

I. The prevailing foot is an IAMBUS, two syllabls with rising accent, the first syllabl being unaccented, the second syllabl having more stress and length than the first. In the first book of Paradise Lost ther ar 798 lines, 3990 feet. Of these, 2586 ar pure iambics.

The distribution by hundreds is as follows: —

Lines.	First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.		Sum.
1–101 . . .	56	69	61	59	76	=	321
101–201 . . .	56	61	57	67	77	=	318
201–301 . . .	57	57	58	69	78	=	319
301–401 . . .	47	58	56	65	69	=	295
401–501 . . .	64	56	63	64	78	=	325
501–601 . . .	55	80	64	65	71	=	335
601–701 . . .	52	75	76	70	69	=	342
701–798 . . .	55	68	62	68	78	=	331
			Total				2586

Only sixty-six lines ar holey pure iambics. Five pairs of like lines ar found: 452–3, 496–7, 538–9, 555–6, 617–8. A duzen other pairs differ only in the caesuras. Sumwhat more than one-third of the feet ar variations for harmony. See *Proceedings*, XIV, xi.

II. Of these many ar falling feet, the most common being the TROCHEE, — two syllabls, of which the first is accented and longer, the second unaccented.

The feet of this kind, arranged in their order by hundred lines, ar as follows: —

Lines.	First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.		Sum.
1–101 . . .	14	1	3	3	0	=	21
101–201 . . .	13	1	3	1	0	=	18
201–301 . . .	23	1	4	7	0	=	35
301–401 . . .	22	2	2	2	0	=	28
401–501 . . .	12	0	5	2	0	=	19
501–601 . . .	23	0	4	2	0	=	29
601–701 . . .	22	0	2	4	0	=	28
701–798 . . .	15	1	3	1	0	=	20
	144						198

Digitized by Google

The reason for so large a proportion being in the first place is twofold, metrical and historical; first, that after the voice has enterd upon the regular series of iambic, rising cadences, it is not easy to change to a falling cadence; second, that the erly English, Anglo-Saxon poetry prevailingly begins its verses with trochees, because the accent is prevailingly on the first syllabl of every word.

In blank verse the falling first foot is useful to mark the beginning of verses, or sections.

The other place in which feet of this kind ar found is after the caesura, at the beginning of the second section. All the exampls in this book ar in these places.

It may be noticed that the metrical reason wil allow a trochee to follow another trochee. And sections having repeated trochees of this kind ar found in other parts of Milton and in Shakespeare.

III. Another peculiar variation is the PYRRHIC, or two unaccented syllabls, the time of the foot being eked out by a rest.

The most frequent and characteristic is divided by the verse caesura, but a pyrrhic may begin or end either section.

It is a slightly rising foot, except when beginning a section.

4. With loss of Ed | en || till | one greater man
5. Restore | us || and | regain the blissful seat.

The first syllabl of the pyrrhic seems like a redundant close of the first section, the second syllabl like an anacrusis of the second section; the caesura fills out the time of the foot; as if this pentameter was a development of the old tetrameter.

Another pyrrhic occurs when two unaccented syllabls ar found in a polysyllabl with a rest of conformation.

100. *And to* the fierce contention brought along
101. Innu*mera*ble force of spirits armed.

The pyrrhics, arranged by the hundred lines, ar in number as follows: —

Lines.	First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.	Sum.
1–101 . . .	2	12	20	11	2 =	47
101–201 . . .	1	10	18	11	3 =	43
201–301 . . .	1	8	13	4	3 =	29
301–401 . . .	6	11	20	18	3 =	48
401–501 . . .	1	15	17	12	3 =	48
501–601 . . .	1	7	12	12	2 =	34
601–701 . . .	1	7	8	7	0 =	23
701–798 . . .	4	8	15	5	5 =	36
	16	78	123	70	21 =	318

The third foot has the most caesuras, and therefore the most pyrrhics.

IV. The most common variation is the SPONDEE or quasi-spondee, a foot of two syllabls, both having stress, and dividing the time nearly equally.

This usually is a rising foot, having slightly more stress on the second syllabl, making the simplest variation of the pure iambus. The following table shows the places and the times of its occurrence: —

Digitized by Google

Lines.	First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.	Sum.
1–101 . . .	23	14	9	15	16	= 77
101–201 . . .	24	19	12	15	12	= 82
201–301 . . .	25	17	12	16	13	= 73
301–401 . . .	22	27	11	18	17	= 95
401–501 . . .	16	15	7	18	12	= 68
501–601 . . .	17	6	8	14	20	= 62
601–701 . . .	21	14	10	15	23	= 83
701–798 . . .	20	17	11	17	10	= 75
	158	129	80	128	123	= 618

The first foot is the one of easy variation.

The third foot contains the most frequent caesura, and therefore the least frequent spondee, since the two long syllabls fil the time. The spondee is frequently and naturally used as a foot of transition from the trochee to the iambus. As ther ar almost no trochees in the second place, ther ar no transition spondees in the third.

V. Another common variation is the ANAPEST, or two unaccented syllabls followd by an accented. The unaccented ar mostly syllabic consonants or glides.

6. Sing, heav*enly Muse.*
11. And Silo*a's brook.*
15. Above *the Ao|nian Mount.*
366. Through God's high suffrance, for the tri*al of man.*

Lines.	First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.	Sum.
1–101 . . .	1	4	6	10	5	= 26
101–201 . . .	0	7	6	6	4	= 23
201–301 . . .	1	5	7	3	6	= 22
301–401 . . .	2	1	9	7	11	= 36
401–501 . . .	1	13	7	7	6	= 34
501–601 . . .	2	6	8	4	7	= 27
601–701 . . .	0	2	4	3	7	= 16
701–798 . . .	1	4	6	6	4	= 21
	8	42	53	46	50	199

VI. Feet of three unaccented syllabls mostly rising ar found with the rests.

1. Of man's first disobed*ience* || *and* the fruit.
118. Since through exper*ience* | *of* this great event.

Of these ther ar in the book 22 feet.

First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.
0	8	10	5	2

156. Fallen cherub, to be weak is mis*erable.*

VII. Ther ar a few FALLING SPONDAIC feet, 21 in all.

First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.
16	0	2	3	0

Digitized by Google

They ar found in the same places as trochees, in the first foot of a section.

21. *Dove-like* sat'st brooding.

VIII. Ther ar also 12 DACTYLS.

87. *Myriads*, though bright.
280. *Groveling* and prostrate.
312. Abject and lost lay these, *covering* the floor.

They also as falling feet ar found at the beginning of sections.

IX. For falling pyrrhics, see III, above.

X. Twelv feet hav an unaccented close.

38. Of rebel angels; by whose aid aspir*ing*.

There ar no unmetrical lines.
Passages wer analyzed to point out their harmony and expressivness.

Remarks were made by Messrs. T. D. Seymour and T. W. Hunt.

5. The Text of Richard de Bury's Philobiblon, by Professor Andrew F. West, of Princeton College, Princeton, N. J.

THE TEXT OF THE PHILOBIBLON OF RICHARD DE BURY.
FINISHED JAN. 24, 1345.

I. The Received Text of the Printed Editions.

Cologne, 1473.
Spires, 1483.
Paris, 1500.
Oxford, 1599.
Frankfort, 1610.
Frankfort, 1614.
Leipsic, 1674.
Helmstadt, 1703.
London, 1832.
Paris, 1856.
Albany, 1861.
London, 1888 (Morley's reprint).

Of these the Cologne, 1473, Spires, 1483 and Oxford, 1599, go back to manuscript sources.

II. The True Text as found in the Manuscripts.

1. Number of known extant Mss. is thirty-five. Apparently eight more lost or at present untraceable. Probably a number more of inferior Mss. in German libraries.

2. Classification of Mss. into two main kinds;—the *standard English tradition* and the *later German variants*.

Digitized by Google

3. The *standard English tradition* in over two-thirds of the Mss., including every Ms. known or suspected to be earlier than 1450, and none after 1460.

They may be classified according to the following general division.

COMPLETE TEXT { Prologue with collected list of chapter titles following and twenty chapters, each headed with a title separately, — colophon also?

(1) A B C D with sixteen others.

A = Ms. *R.* 8, *F. xiv.* in British Museum, date 1380.
B = Ms. *Digby* 147, Bodleian Library, date 1370.
C = Ms. 15168 in National Library, Paris, date 1440.
D = Ms. 3352*c* in National Library, Paris, date 1430.

INCOMPLETE TEXT — in three manuscripts.

Magdalen Ms. (VI. 164), Oxford, date about 1400, — lacks prologue and end of XIXth chapter.

St. John's Ms. (CLXXII), Oxford, date about 1400, — lacks last half of chapter IX, all of chapter X, and opening of chapter XI.

Brussels 11465, date early XVth century, — lacks collected chapter titles at end of prologue and separate titles at head of each chapter.

The headings, chapter titles, colophon and body of the text in the English tradition. Full form of the colophon (an integral part of the original text) is

Explicit Philobiblon domini Ricardi de Aungervile,
cognominati de Bury, quondam Episcopi Dunelmensis.
Completus est autem tractatus iste in manerio nostro de Aukelande xxiiij die Januarii
anno Domini millesimo trecentesimo quadragesimo quarto,
aetatis nostrae quinquagesimo octavo praecise completo,
pontificatus vero nostri anno undecimo finiente,
ad laudem Dei feliciter et Amen.

4. The *later German variants* are at least seven in number. None earlier than 1450–60, and running on to 1492.

Copied in Germany.

The main variations are twofold.

(1) The chapter titles mainly or wholly changed. Due to what?

(2) The body of the text altered at pleasure, wherever unintelligible to scribe. Perhaps 1500 variations from the early English Ms., out of, say, 9000 words in the treatise.

The effect of this is of course to alter and obscure the meaning of the author, to debase his style.

5. From the German variants comes the received text of the Philobiblon, as seen in *editio princeps* Cologne 1473 and all the editions derived from it. From an arbitrarily altered poor English Ms. comes the Spires Ed. of 1483. From an uncritical examination of six English Mss. comes the Oxford Ed. of 1599. The English Mss. contain the true text. Two only certainly of XIVth century (A and B).

6. Mr. Thomas's Edition (London, 1888). The Grolier Club's Edition (1889, New York).

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX TO ABSTRACT.

General View of the Manuscripts of the Philobiblon.

I. THE ENGLISH TRADITION preserves the true text in twenty-three Mss. ranging in date from 1370 to 1450 or later.

Text substantially complete in twenty Mss. including ABCD and ranging in date from 1370 to 1450 or later.

Text defective in three Mss. from 1400 to 1430.

Brussels No. 11465. Early XVth century. Lacks heading, collected and separate chapter titles and colophon.

Magdalen Ms., Oxford. Date 1400. Lacks prologue and end of chapter XIX.

St. John's Ms., Oxford. Date 1400. Lacks end of chapter IX, all of X, and beginning of XI.

?

II. THE GERMAN VARIANTS, containing a corrupted text, without headings or with new headings, lacking collected chapter titles and colophons, and with new separate chapter titles. Not improbably originating from some incomplete Ms. of the English tradition (like Brussels 11465). Found in seven Mss. dating from 1450 to 1491. The *editio princeps* and printed texts derived from it come from this source.

III. UNCLASSIFIED MSS., five in number—
Two at Munich, one each at Venice, Bamberg, and Brussels (No. 3725).

IV. LOST OR UNTRACEABLE MSS.—
Apparently eight in number.

6. Open Questions in English Philology, by Professor Theodore W. Hunt, of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.

After calling attention to the origin and history of the scientific study of English, and to the relation of settled to unsettled questions in philology, Professor Hunt invited the Association to consider some of the most important open questions in English philology. A brief abstract of the points stated and discussed is as follows: —

1. The question of English philological Nomenclature, with special reference to the use of the terms *Saxon, Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, Semi-Saxon.* It was held that we should adopt the one term *English* as applicable to all the different periods of the language.

2. The question of English philological Method among the possible methods open to the student, such as the comparative, etymological, and literary. Here it was urged that some one of these should be prominent, while emphasis was laid upon the literary side of linguistics as being more important than that conceded to it by general criticism.

3. The question of the relation of British English to American English. It was the object of the discussion, in this connection, to show the points of difference and of resemblance between these two branches or forms of English, and especially to press the principle of their substantial unity and co-operative growth. The true relation of English dialects to what are called provincialisms was here shown, while it was argued that the term *dialect* meant in England much more than it means in this country.

4. The question of the *native* English element in our Modern English vocabulary. The extreme and untenable theories on this subject were briefly stated, and

Digitized by Google

English scholars were warned against the tendency unduly to eliminate the native element in favor of foreign influence. Special notice was taken of the attempt to estimate far too highly the Celtic and Scandinavian influence in English.

5. The question of English Lexicography was then discussed, with primary reference to its rightful province. The encyclopedic tendency was noticed as the prevailing tendency in modern lexical work. Against this, ground was taken on the principle that it was far exceeding its rightful limits.

In conclusion, the paper made reference to the new and scholarly interest evinced in all departments of English philology, particularly, in its older periods and forms, and urged the importance of magnifying the intellectual and ethical elements in language above the merely verbal.

Remarks were made by Messrs. J. Sachs, F. A. March, and A. F. West.

7. Differentiation of the Uses of *shall* and *will*, by Professor George P. Garrison, of the University of Texas.

I take it that *shall* originally expressed a *present* necessity or obligation, and *will* a *present* volition or desire. It was very natural, however, to associate with these ideas of necessity and volition that of a subsequent result; and, as the use of *shall* and *will* as auxiliaries grew, they became auxiliaries for the future in so far as they carried this associated idea and kept less of their original meaning. Thus it came about that *shall go*, for example, signified: (1) a present necessity or obligation to go, and (2) a future result in the act of going. Similarly, *will go* signified: (1) a present desire or volition to go, and (2) a future result in the act of going.

But these ideas were not allowed to develop evenly. The Anglo-Saxon and his English descendant has always been domineering, inclined to magnify the importance of his own will and to regard lightly that of others. Under the influence of this quality, when he used *shall* with the first person he obscured the idea of necessity, because it was unpalatable to him, and dwelling upon the result made a pure future. But in the second and third persons he was willing enough for *shall* to imply necessity, especially if he were the agent that imposed it. He so used it, and in these two persons *shall* remained present. In using *will*, the same characteristic led him to make prominent the idea of volition in the first person and to obscure it in the second and third. Thus *will* has become mostly present in the first person, and future in the second and third.

Remarks were made by Messrs. F. A. March and T. D. Seymour.

At 12 M. the Association adjourned to meet at 1.30 P. M.

EASTON, PA., July 10, 1889.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Association was called to order at 1.30 P. M. by the President.

8. On the Interpretation of Aristoph. Ach. 849, by Frank W. Nicolson, Esq., Instructor in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Digitized by Google

The words μιᾷ μαχαίρᾳ in this line are commonly understood to refer to the razor. The aim of this paper is to show that a form of shears is meant, and that the reference is to clipping and not shaving.

Another name for the μία μάχαιρα was ψαλίς (cf. Pollux X. 140 and Photius' definition; cf. also Pollux II. 32, where the correct reading is not διπλῇ, but μιᾷ, as given by Mss. C. and V.). The words μάχαιρα and μαχαιρίς do not, as generally supposed, relate to the razor, but to various forms of shears. (Cf. Arist. Frag. II. Thesm. and Lucian, Adv. Ind. 29, where these are mentioned respectively as distinct from the ξυρόν.) This is proved also by the order of the words in the two lists of barbers' implements given by Pollux (X. 140 and II. 32).

The shears used by the Greek barber were of two forms. The διπλῇ μάχαιρα resembled the form most common in modern days, consisting of two pieces of metal fastened together by a rivet in the middle. A representation is to be found in a terra-cotta from Tanagra (*vide* Arch. Ztg. XXXII. taf. 14). The μία μάχαιρα or ψαλίς, on the other hand, was formed from a single piece of elastic metal bent in the middle and having the two edges sharpened. It is represented in a Pompeian wall-painting (*vide* Abh. der Sächs. Gesell. der Wiss. V. plate VI. 5). The word ψαλίς means a vault or arch, and as applied to this form of shears no doubt refers to the curved or rounded end made by bending the metal on itself.

The μία μάχαιρα seems to have resembled in shape the old-fashioned sheep-shears still used in some parts of this country. There is evidence that it was employed by the ancients in sheep-shearing (cf. Hesychius' definition of μάχαιραι: οἷς ἀποκείρεται τὰ πρόβατα; cf. also Galen, quoted by Steph. in his Thesaurus, *s.v.* κείρω: κείρεσθαι τὰ πρόβατα ὑπὸ τῶν ψαλίδων). Lucian, Pisc. 46, proposes as a punishment for a false philosopher: ἀποκειράτω τὸν πώγωνα ἐν χρῷ πάνυ τραγοκουρικῇ μαχαίρᾳ. These goat-shears were probably the same in form as the ψαλίς, or sheep-shears, and a similar punishment to that proposed by Lucian may be here alluded to by Aristophanes.

That shears (μάχαιραι κουρίδες) served the double purpose of shearing sheep and clipping men's hair appears from a fragment of Cratinus, Dion. II. The ψαλίς was particularly fitted for shearing sheep, since it could be operated by one hand, leaving the other free to manage the animal being sheared. Finally, the words of Phrynicus, 319, seem to favor this interpretation: τὸ μὲν γὰρ (*i.e.* καρῆναι, as opposed to κείρασθαι) ἐπὶ προβάτων τιθέασι καὶ ἐπὶ ἀτίμου κουρᾶς.

9. The Dramatic Features of Winter's Tale, by Professor Thomas R. Price, of Columbia College, New York, N. Y.

This play, which belongs to the last stage of Shakspere's dramatic method, is not, as commonly conceived, a violation of the laws of dramatic construction, but an ingenious experiment in the application of those laws. It is constructed on the plan of the *diptych*, a form of art in which two compositions, each in itself complete, are merged into a composition of a higher kind, which comprehends them both. For this purpose, the drama divides itself into two (2) distinct parts, a tragedy of (28) twenty-eight scenes, ending at III. 3, 58, and a comedy of (22) twenty-two scenes, stretching from that point to the end. To carry on these two movements, the characters are divided into (3) three groups, one group of (9) nine characters that belong altogether to the tragedy, one group of (12) twelve

Digitized by Google

characters that belong altogether to the comedy, and one group of (7) seven characters that belong in common to the tragedy and to the comedy.

Of these two parts, each, according to the law of construction, is complete in itself. The tragedy has a *protasis* of 8 stages, an *epitasis* of 5 stages, a well-marked *climax* in II. 3, a *catabasis* of 5 stages, and a *catastrophe* of 3 stages. The comedy has a short *protasis* of only 3 stages, because many of the comedy-characters are known to us already from the tragedy. It has an *epitasis* of 5 stages, a well-marked *climax* in IV. 4, a *catabasis* of 10 stages, and a *catastrophe* of 2 stages. The only irregularity is the immense length of the comic *catabasis:* and this double length, 10 stages instead of 5, comes from the necessity of merging at this point the two movements into one catastrophe.

Thus Shakspere, at the end of his career, worked out in the Winter's Tale, as a bold experiment in dramatic construction, the fusion of two distinct passions and of two distinct actions into a new form of romantic drama.

Remarks were made by Professor F. A. March.

10. Roman Elements in English Law, by Herbert L. Baker, Esq., of Detroit, Mich.

It is now a well-recognized fact that English law contains a very considerable Roman element.

The presence of this element presents a difficult problem in English legal history for the reasons that (1) Roman law was never recognized by the common law courts as having any authority in England, and (2) it has long been the accepted theory that the English common law is indigenous customary law deriving its sanction from immemorial usage — a theory which necessarily excludes foreign elements. The subject seems to have been hitherto discussed from a legal standpoint only and by means of comparisons instituted between rules existing in English and Roman law respectively. Such method of treatment assumes that the Roman element came in in the form of positive rules, and it is adapted to reaching only such part of it as came in thus, which part, there is reason to think, is but a small fraction of the whole. It is proposed here to view the subject from a philological standpoint. The fact that Roman law as such was excluded by English national policy and prejudice affords a hint that much the greater part of the Roman element must have effected its entrance in some form more subtle than that of positive rules. While Roman law as such was excluded, Roman legal thought, which may be regarded as Roman law held in solution, might and did enter into English thought unhindered and on practically an equal footing with other branches of ancient learning. If we can trace the Roman element as it exists in legal thought, it is evident that we shall thus arrive at a juster estimate of its character and extent than by a comparison of positive rules. A means of thus tracing the Roman element is afforded by the composite character of our language. English law has borrowed freely from Roman legal terminology; the words thus borrowed are capable of identification; wherever one of these words expresses thought which has never been expressed by a native word, it may justly be inferred that the thought also was borrowed, at least to the extent of the meaning attached to the word when it was adopted into English speech. The words belonging to our

Digitized by Google

legal terminology, as given in a standard law dictionary, number 1738. Of these 1363 are of Latin origin, and 375 are of other origin, mostly Anglo-Saxon. Very few, if any, of these Latin words have complete equivalents in words of native origin. It follows, therefore, that more than four-fifths of our elementary legal thought has been borrowed from the Romans. This general deduction must, like all such, be taken *cum grano salis*. Some allowance should doubtless be made for lost words and meanings of words, and for an affectation of Latinity on the part of lawyers and others. With such allowances, the conclusion is in the main justifiable, because none of the ideas represented by those words were ever communicated by one English-speaking person to another until it was done through the medium of the foreign word; and in order to render the idea thus communicable, both speaker and hearer must have learned the word and its meaning from the Romans.

For a complete acquaintance with the Roman element and its nature, a study in detail of individual words and their history is requisite. Some general idea may, however, be gained by a grouping of words according to subjects, and a comparison of the native and Roman elements as thus exhibited. The proportion of native and Roman words pertaining to some of the principal branches of the law are as follows: (1) *Public Law: Organic, International, etc.*, native words, 20; Roman, 135. (2) *Public Law: Criminal*, native words, 10; Roman, 54. (3) *The Law of Procedure*, native words, 7; Roman, 123. (4) *The Law of Property*, native words, 49; Roman, 171. (5) *The Law of Contract*, native words, 14; Roman, 112. Of the remaining 1043 words not embraced in either of the foregoing groups, 889 of the more important give 229 words of native and 660 of Roman origin. An examination of these groups discloses the fact that the Roman words, as compared with the native, are almost invariably expressive of ideas belonging to a more advanced and settled political society and shows in a striking manner in how great a degree the English state and its laws were developed upon intellectual lines marked out by the Romans. Thus in the first group (Organic Law) the native element gives us "baron," "barrister," "earl," "gerefa," "king," "queen," "lord," "sheriff," "thane," "borough," "hundred," "woodmote," "folkgemote," "shiregemote," "witanagemote," while the Roman element gives us "constable," "coroner," "surrogate," "attorney," "solicitor," "magistrate," "judge," "chancellor," "court," "county," "district," "municipality," "statute," "legislation," "Congress," "Parliament," "exchequer," "revenue," "sovereignty," "constitution," "government," "state," "nation," "society."

2. In the second group (Criminal Law) the words descriptive of offences against property are, (1) native, "blackmail," and "theft," (2) Roman, "arson," "burglary," "champerty," "embezzlement," "embracery," "forgery," "larceny," "maintenance," "piracy," "robbery." And the words pertaining to the administration of criminal law are almost wholly Roman, the native words being only "guilt" and "outlaw," as against twenty-eight Roman words, such as "arrest," "capital," "conviction," "crime," "defence," "indictment," "innocent," "penalty," "perjury," "prosecution," "punishment," "reward," "sentence."

3. The legal ideas contained in the law of procedure are expressed almost wholly in Roman words. The seven native words are "forswear," "oath," "set-off," "speaking," "wager," "battel." In contrast with these there are 123 Roman words with well-defined technical meanings, most of which are now in constant use.

Digitized by Google

4. In the law of property the native words are in greater proportion, but are of the same relative character. They are usually designative of material things; *e.g.*, "building," "dwelling," "farm," "homestead," "house," "land," "thing," while the Roman words usually designate more abstract conceptions, such as are involved in apprehending and defining the relations subsisting between persons in reference to material things; *e.g.*, "adverse," "common," "descent," "dower," "entail," "estate," "heir," "hereditament," "lease," "mortgage," "real," "rent," "seisin," "tenure," "title."

5. In the law of contract the same relative characteristics are exhibited, with a much larger proportion of Roman words. The native words are "bearer," "bond," "borrow," "bottomry," "breach," "drawer," "holder," "loan," "maker," "sale," "seller," "settlement," "sight," "warehouse." In contrast with these are 112 Roman words, such, for example, as "agreement," "bailment," "charter," "condition," "consent," "consideration," "contract," "covenant," "damages," "debt," "default," "due," "interest," "note," "obligation," "partner," "pledge," "principal," "promise," "special," "surety," "warranty," etc.

6. Of the unclassified words the following are examples of the more important: native, "free," "gift," "law," "mistake," "owner"; Roman, "custom," "duty," "general," "injury," "judicial," "juridical," "jurisprudence," "jury," "justice," "moral," "principal."

The position taken in this paper must not be understood too broadly. It is not asserted that prior to the adoption of any given Roman word the Anglo-Saxons had *nothing* of what afterwards came to be designated by that word. On the contrary, they had the *rudiments*, actually or potentially, of *all* that they afterwards acquired both with and without the aid of Roman ideas. The position here is that, by a kind of educational process, they gradually grew into and possessed themselves of these portions of the intellectual world which the Romans had created, and that the Roman words which they at the same time adopted, constitute an important record of the process by which Roman thought was thus taken up and assimilated. Thus, for example, as to the word "judge": some of the functions of judgeship were of course exercised among them before the borrowing of the word "judex" (such functions in more or less rudimentary form being exercised in all stages of organized society); but those functions were as yet but rudely conceived, and were bound up with, and were undifferentiated in thought from, legislative and executive functions. The introduction of the word "judex" to designate an officer charged only with judicial functions marks the beginning of that process of dividing up and distributing sovereign power which has led to the present well-established and familiar threefold division of sovereign power into Legislative, Executive, and Judicial.

So also the words "state," "nation," and "government" indicate, not that the Anglo-Saxons had nothing of what afterwards came to be designated by these words, but that they had not yet reached the stage of political development which would enable them to evolve the distinct and separate conception of a "state," a "nation," or an impersonal "government," and to produce the institutions properly corresponding to such conceptions.

Viewed thus as a part of our intellectual inheritance derived from ancient learning, the Roman element is seen to be very large, and at the same time it ceases to present an insoluble enigma. Its presence in English law can from this

Digitized by Google

standpoint be accounted for, but not without some modification of the theory above adverted to. For this reason amongst others a thorough study of this subject promises to be productive of important practical results, by leading to a critical examination of that theory *de novo* and thereby to a truer understanding of the essential nature of our law.

11. An Unstable Idiom in English, by Dr. C. P. G. Scott, of New York, N.Y.

At 3.30 P. M. the members of the Association and their friends, escorted by thirty gentlemen of Easton, of the Committee on Entertainment, proceeded in carriages to Paxinosa Inn, where a large part of the afternoon and evening was pleasantly spent in the grounds and on the piazzas of the hotel. Before dinner an address was made by William Hackett, Jr., Esq., Chairman of the Committee on Entertainment, to which President Seymour responded, and grace was said by President Knox.

At 7.45 P. M. the Association was called to order in the parlors of the Inn, and listened to communications from two of the members.

12. The Pronunciation near Fredericksburg, Va., by Professor Sylvester Primer, of the College of Charleston, Charleston, S. C.

Prof. Edward A. Freeman, writing or speaking to a friend in regard to a young American who was going to the University of Jena in order to study Anglo-Saxon, remarked: "Why does he not go to Orange County, Va., instead of to Jena? They speak very good West Saxon in Orange County." This statement may serve as an introduction to my remarks on the pronunciation of Fredericksburg, Va. For Stafford, Spottsylvania, and Orange counties have about the same pronunciation, and have preserved to a remarkable degree the older English sounds brought over in the 17th century by the early settlers of this region.

This section of the country was the earliest settled. Stafford first appears as a county in 1666. Among the early names of the county are Scott, Moncure, Houseman, Mercer, Donithan, Tyler, Montjoy, Strother, Fitzhugh, Deyton, Daniel, Traverse, Cooke. Their descendants still live in various parts of the country. Spottsylvania was founded in 1720. Some of the prominent names are Taliafero, Thornton, Lewis, Carter, Washington, Herndon, Ficklin. Orange County was formed later, dating from 1734. The principal families of Orange in colonial times are the Barbours, Bells, Burtons, Campbells, Caves, Chews, Conways, Daniels, Madisons, Moores, Ruckers, Shepherds, Taylors, Taliaferos, Whites, Thomases, and Waughs, whose descendants are still living.

As early as 1675 there was a fort on the present site of Fredericksburg, but it was not incorporated till 1727. Among the prominent names we find Robinson, Willis, Smith, Taliaferro, Beverly, Waller, Clowder, Mercer, Weedon, Lewis, Washington, Littleplace, Forsyth, Conway, Fitzhugh, Moncure, Carter, Lee, many of which are still prominent in and about Fredericksburg. In Fredericksburg

Digitized by Google

itself descendants of Carter Braxton, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, are still living. A comparison of the earlier names with those of the present inhabitants shows that the present families represent almost exclusively the earlier families. Intermixture from without has not been great, foreigners have rarely sought homes here, and immigration from other states has been limited.

The early settlers were men of education. They studied at Cambridge, Oxford, Dublin, and Edinburgh, and at Temple Bar. Professional men were all educated in England. For the poor almost no provision was made. Sir William Berkeley in his day rejoiced that there was not a free school or printing-press in Virginia, and hoped it might be so for a hundred years to come. The rich had private tutors at their own houses, the poor remained ignorant. There were no libraries of any account. The sons of the rich were sent to England for their education up to the time of the Revolution. "The College of William and Mary, from the year 1700 and onward, did something toward educating a small portion of the youth of Virginia, and that was all until Hampden Sidney, at a much later period, was established." However poor the school system of the colony and young state was, the education of the superior class has ever been a matter of pride. Virginia has produced more great men than any other state, and the intellectual life has ranked high. She has won for herself the proud title of the "Mother of Presidents."

The English of the 17th century, with proper regard to that of the 16th and 18th centuries, forms the basis of the comparison of Fredericksburg's present pronunciation. Three extracts from early documents of Virginia with the approximate pronunciation of that day are given, and the pronunciation of the present traced back to that. The first is taken from The First Assembly of Virginia, held July 30, 1619. The second is from A Briefe Declaration of the Plantation of Virginia. The third is from Captain Smith's True Relation.

The tabular view of the Virginia Sounds at this period will be best understood in connection with the extracts in the full article; it would be impossible to give either here in this brief extract. A few of the more prominent peculiarities of the Fredericksburg pronunciation are given to show the tenor of the article.

The sound (i). The word "tester" is here pronounced (tiister) as in Charleston, S. C. In Latin words like *simultaneous*, etc., the *i* is generally pronounced (əi, səi-mʊl-t*ee*-ni-əs), rarely (*i*). In words like *Palestine* the sound fluctuates between (əi) and (ii), but inclines mostly to the latter. *Ef* for *if* is sometimes heard. For *mill*, *hill*, I heard in two instances (mil, Hil) quite distinctly, but am not sure that it was not an individual rather than general pronunciation. The word *ear* is here pronounced (yiir) by the vulgar.

The long and short *e* differ but slightly from the accepted pronunciation elsewhere. The shades between this and the next sound (æ) show a diversity of sounds in words that generally have the sound (æ) and in Charleston, S. C., have (ee). Words like *here*, *pare*, *pair*, *tare*, *bear*, etc., which in Charleston generally have the sound (æ) or (ææ), are divided in Fredericksburg between (ii), (æ) and (EE). The sound (EE) is somewhat common in many of these words, but not so common as the Charleston (ee). In some the sound is short (E). There is the same fluctuation between (agEn) and (ag*een*), (agEnst) and (ag*ee*nst) as is found everywhere. The Latin prefix *pre-* has the two sounds (ii) and (e) in

Digitized by Google

words like *predicessor* (prii-d*i*-sesɹ, or pred-*i*-sesr). The word *here* sometimes has a peculiar pronunciation. It is often pronounced ('jĭr). The sound *e* and *a* exchange in *yes* and *well* (pr. yas, wal); *e* also exchanges with *i* in *yesterday*, *yes*, *yet*, *get*, *kettle*, etc. (pr. yis, yit, etc.).

The long sound of (ææ) is heard in *calm*, *psalm*, *balm*, etc. (pr. kææm, sææm, bææm, etc.). But the ordinary pronunciation is also heard (kaam, saam, baam). The words *ask*, *demand*, are also divided between the sound (ææ) and (aa) (ææsk or aask). Compare also (pææs or paas), and we even hear (pAAs or pAs). *Passable* and *Possible* are said to be indistinguishable in their pronunciation by many. Words in *au*, like *gaunt*, *daunt*, etc., have three grades, (ææ), (aa), and (AA). These different pronunciations here mentioned are all found among the cultured, and is said to be traditional in families. As they all go back to the 17th century, they were probably brought over here and handed down from father to son.

There are one or two peculiarities under the *a*-sound. Among the vulgar the words *there*, *where*, are pronounced (dhar, whar). The genuine *a*-sound is heard in various words that have in other localities the (æ) or (e) sound. *Mayor* sounded to me as spoken by one person (maa-r). *Stairs* are often called (staars) by the illiterate, *bears* (baars), etc.

The A-sound is heard in *dog* and *God* (dAg, GAd, and even dAAg, GAAd). But the ɔ-sound may also be heard in these words (dɔg, Gɔd, and dɔɔg, Gɔɔd). The words *not*, *God*, *gaud*, form a rising scale. *Not* is short, *God* is longer, and *gaud* is longest (ɔ, A, AA), and we generally find *dog* and *God* running through the whole scale in the same locality. In Fredericksburg I have heard (dɔg, Gɔd, dAg, GAd, dAAg, GAAd). The word *pond* varies in its pronunciation in different sections of the country. All three sounds can be found in Charleston, S. C. (pɔnd, pAnd, pAAnd). The careless often pronounce it just like the word *pawned;* the elegant pronunciation is the middle sound of our series (pAnd); many pronounce it (pɔnd). In Fredericksburg the first and second (pɔnd, pAnd) are heard, never the third. The word *hog* (generally Hɔg, or Hɔɔg) is often pronounced (HAg or HAAg) in Fredericksburg.

The *o*-sound has one or two peculiarities. The word *poor* almost always has the long sound of *o* and drops its *r* (p*oo*). For the dropping of the *r* see under *r* in the consonants. The two pronunciations of *progress*, *process*, (prɔɔgres, pr*oo*gres, prɔɔses, pr*oo*ses) prevail here. The preposition *to* often has the older pronunciation of (t*oo*), as in the time of Chaucer and Shakespeare, now becoming obsolete.

The long *u* appears to have more of the i-Vorschlag in certain words than ordinarily, making it almost a distinct syllable. I am almost inclined to think that it is rather a (y)-Vorschlag. Thus *due* (*dew*), *do*, *too*, etc., sound to me (dü-u, tü-u, or dy-u, ty-u), with the accent on the (ü or y). Some, however, regularly pronounce these words (diu^2, tiu^2) where the ^{2} denotes a prolonged vanish. The word *put* (also in a less degree *could*, *would*, *should*) shows the same peculiarity as in Charleston, S. C. It is frequently pronounced (pət, rarely kəd, wəd, shəd). More probably the peculiar sound of *could*, *would*, *should* is the same as that heard in *prove*, *move*, and others. The sound here is to me a diphthong beginning with an (y) and ending with (*u*), thus (pry-*uv*, my-*uv*; perhaps ky-*u*d, etc.). The two sounds follow each other very rapidly, and it is difficult to

Digitized by Google

detect the two shades of sound of the first and second components of the diphthong. The word *spoon* has the same sound (spy-*un*), but see under diphthongs. The *u*-sound in *fruit* appears to me to be quite peculiar. As near as I can make out it sounds nearly like the double French *u*, thus (fry-yt); the word appears to be dissyllabic, though the last syllable may be only the prolonged vanish. I have also noticed this same sound in people from the middle and upper part of the state of South Carolina. It has puzzled me very much. This sound may be the (yy), or the (yyw), or the (yy) with a labial modification. I hardly consider it the (iu). All these shades of sound have been handed down from the 17th century.

The diphthongs show quite a number of peculiarities. Jones (1701) says that *ai* has the sound of *a* in some words. Ellis thinks the two sounds indicated by Jones were (ee) and (*ee*), and though *ai* was sounded *a* by some people, it was not considered best. Jones gives quite a long list, among which we notice the word *stair* (pronounced staar by some), already mentioned. Here belongs also *bear*, an animal, pronounced (baar) by some. We have noticed the pronunciation of *due*, *do*, etc. This leads us to consider the diphthong *eu*, which Ellis says the Americans pronounce (*i*u) rather than (iu), and even (eu) remains here in some parts. I believe it possible to hear all three in America. In Fredericksburg I am inclined to think (iu) or even (üu) is the prevailing pronunciation. Some prolong it so that I heard (nieu), (dieu), etc. The (au) becomes (æu) in *house* (Hæus), where it is short. In *town* it is long (tææun). In *out* it is very short (æut). Thus we have very short in (*out*, *about*, *south*, etc), short (in *house*, etc.), and long (in *town*, *cow*, etc.). The (ou) is heard in Fredericksburg, but not in *house*. There it is more often heard in *boat*, and similar words. As near as I could make out, I heard the sound (bout) in the pronunciation of *boat* almost always. Frequently I thought I detected the sound (bAut), but the (A) was very short. The pronunciation of *spoon*, *could*, *point*, *shook*, *good* (almost gyŭd), has been mentioned.

There is little to be said of the consonants. The (*h*) often suffixes a (j) and becomes a breathing, as ('jeer) for *here* (Hür). The exchange of *w* for *v*, as *prowok*, *wocation*, for *provoke*, *vocation*, is no oftener heard here than elsewhere. In the combination *wh* both letters are sounded. The *r* is at all events an evanescent sound and difficult to detect. In Fredericksburg it disappears in words like *more*, *door*, *floor*, *war*. And yet its influence is felt. Professor March told me that he explained this peculiar pronunciation of the final *r* after vowels as an attempt to pronounce the *r* by assuming the *r* position after the enunciation of the vowel and then stopping just before the real enunciation of the *r*. This appears to me to be the true explanation. Indicating the preparation for the *r* by (') this peculiar pronunciation may be expressed (m*oo*', d*oo*', fl*oo*', wA').

The usual dropping of the *g* in *ing* is heard here as elsewhere. The consonants *g* and *k* insert the (j) after them. Thus *cart*, *garden*, *girl*, etc., are pronounced (kjart, gjardn, etc.). Even *school* seems to fall under this rubric and becomes sometimes (skjuul).

The accent of the word *idea* has changed here to the antepenult (ídea).

The above is only a beginning of studies of the pronunciation of Fredericksburg, and I hope hereafter to continue them. Any suggestions, corrections, or information will be gladly received.

Digitized by Google

Remarks were made by Messrs. A. F. West, T. R. Price, and F. A. March.

13. Some Syriac Legends, by Professor Isaac H. Hall, of the Metropolitan Museum, Central Park, New York, N. Y.

This was intended as an informal communication rather than a regular paper, and in fact was a mere talk. The legends spoken of were (1) The Legend of Romulus and Remus and the founding of Rome, and (2) a collection of legends in a manuscript recently received from Urmî in Persia, which are extant in a few manuscripts in Karshûn, but not heretofore found in Syriac. These were: A Colloquy of Moses with the Lord on Mount Sinai; The Letter of Holy Sunday that fell from Heaven upon the Hands of Athanasius Patriarch of Rome, being the Third Letter [of its sort]; and The Narrative of Arsenius King of Egypt, and how our Lord raised him to life (containing an account of man's experiences at and after death, with a description of Gehenna).

Since the legends in the Urmî manuscript need the Syriac text for proper appreciation, they will be published elsewhere; and no abstract of them is fairly called for here. The legend of Romulus and Remus seems to be of interest to the Association, however, and a translation of it is therefore given here. The original is to be found in a Nitrian manuscript written A.D. 837 (Brit. Mus. Addit. 12152, fol. 194 ff.). The text is printed in Paul de Lagarde's *Analecta Syriaca* (pp. 201–205), a work of which 115 copies were issued. A partial translation is to be found in B. Harris Cowper's *Syriac Miscellanies*, a work now quite scarce. It is a fragment from the Roman History of Diocles, and bears probable marks of translation from the Greek.

As the legend is quite closely connected with the preceding one of the settlement of Syria, Cilicia, and Phœnicia, it seems best to give the whole together. A distorted form of that portion which treats of Hercules and the Tyrian purple occurs also in a much later composition called the "Cave of Treasures," of which at least one manuscript exists in New York, and which Bezold has published in German and Syriac under the title of *Die Schatzhöhle* (Leipzig, 1883, 1888). In the "Cave of Treasures," however, Hiram King of Tyre replaces Punicus, and Hercules is suppressed — perhaps as a character not altogether in place in a strictly religious composition.

The following is the translation: —

THE WRITING OF DIOCLES THE WISE.

Now after the division of tongues in the days of Peleg there was [born] a certain man of the sons of Japhet, who was called Ag'ûr (or, Ig'ûr). This one went up from the east and came and dwelt on the sea-shore, and built a city and called its name Ge'ûr, which in the Syriac tongue is called Tyre (Ṣûr). And there were [born] to him three sons, Syrus (Sûrôs) his first born, and Cilicus (Qûlîqôs) his second, and Punicus (Pûnîqôs) his third. And Ag'ûr their father was king in Tyre 13 years. And when he died he divided the land to his sons; to Punicus he gave Phœnicia (Pûnîqâ, or Pûnîqî), and to Cilicus he gave Cilicia (Qûlîqyâ, or Qûlîqîyâ), and to Syrus he gave Syria (Sûrîyâ).

And in the time of Punicus was [born] Hercules (Heraqlîs, or Harqlîs), a man

Digitized by Google

wise and mighty in valor. For when this hero was commanding[1] upon the sea-shore of Tyre, he saw a certain shepherd's dog capture a shell-fish of the sea, that is called *conchylium*, and eat of it, so that the dog's mouth was stained with the blood of the shell-fish. And Hercules called to him the shepherd of the flock, and told him about the dog; and forthwith the shepherd brought wool, and with it wiped out the mouth of the dog, and of the wool the shepherd made himself a crown and put it upon his head. Then when the sun shone upon it, Hercules saw the crown of wool, that it was very splendid, and he was astonished at its beauty; and he took the crown from the shepherd. But the next day Hercules took the shepherd and the dog, and went out to the sea-shore. And the dog, as he was walking along, saw a shell-fish, and the dog ran and caught it; but Hercules snatched the shell-fish from his mouth, and let the shepherd go to his flock. And Hercules walked every day upon the sea-shore, and as soon as one of those shell-fish came out from the sea, he ran quickly and caught it. So he gathered 30 of them, and he boiled them over a fire, and dyed white wool with their blood. And he gave it to a certain woman, and she made of it for him a garment, and he took that clothing and brought it in to Punicus the king of Tyre, who, when he saw it, wondered at its beauty, and commanded that no one except himself should wear it, but the king (or, the one acting as king) only. And moreover, he gave to Hercules authority to be commander in his place, and wrote that he was the father of the kingdom [*i.e.* prime minister]. And it was this Hercules that showed the dyeing of all manner of beautiful colors; and how, moreover, pearls go up from the sea he showed and taught to men.

In those days there was [born] a man in the country of the west, whose name was Rômtyâ (or Rômyâ or Rômayâ, = Ῥωμαῖος); and the man was a mighty hero. Now in his days there was in the island of Cilicia a certain virgin beautiful in appearance, who had been made priestess in the temple (ναὸς) of the god Arîs (Ἄρης). And when Rômtyâ saw [her], he lusted after her, and he went in unto her, and she conceived from him. And when she perceived that she had conceived from him, she was in great fear, and kept herself close, in order that the priests of the god Arîs should not detect it and kill her. And when she had borne two twins [*sic* — idiomatic], their father took them and gave them to a certain woman, who reared them. And when the boys were grown up and become men, their father gave them names; to the one Romulus (Rômullôs, Rômillôs, or Rômellôs), and to the other Remus (Rômôs). And they built the city Rome (Rômâ or Rômt) and . . .[2] it, and all their subjects[3] they called Romans (Rômayê = Ῥωμαῖοι) after the name of their father; and for this reason the sons of Rome are called Romans. And, moreover, they built the capitol (qâpitôlôn), which interpreted is, the Head of the city; and it is one of the wonders of the whole earth [*lit.* one out of the wonders that are in the whole earth]. And they brought a great image that had been in Helûdûs (or Helôdôs, possibly Ἑλλάδος, genitive),[4]

[1] A rather difficult word; probably the imported παραγγέλλω, in a peculiar reflexive participial form. "On a tour of inspection and improvement" is perhaps the meaning.

[2] Part of word obliterated. Probably "ruled as kings in" is to be supplied.

[3] This is the right rendering if I guess rightly how to supply the obliterated place preceding. Otherwise, "workmen" or "cultivators."

[4] If this conjecture is correct, then the rendering of the clause is "that had been in [the land] of Hellas."

Digitized by Google

and raised and set it above the top of the capitol, and it was a great wonder, whose like has not been on the earth. And they built the great dîmôsîôn (δημόσιον) that is in Athens (Athînis, = Athēnis, Ἀθῆναις), and the philosophers called it the dîmôsîôn of wisdom (sôphîâ).

Now then there arose a quarrel between the two brothers, and Romulus (Armillôs, Armellôs, or Armullôs, = ὁ Ῥώμολος) rose up and slew his brother Remus. And straightway the city began to quake; and when the sons of Rome saw that their city was quaking, they feared with great fear, and all its inhabitants sought to flee out of it. And when Romulus saw that the sons of Rome were in commotion at the temple (ναὸς) of the goddess Pûthinayâ (or Pûthinîâ, or Pûthinyâ — or perhaps better, of the Pythian goddess), he asked of her that she would reveal to him for what cause the city was quaking. And she answered him, "Because you have slain your brother the city is quaking and mourning; because he built it with you. And there will be no cessation from the earthquake until it [*i.e.* the city] sees your brother sitting with you upon the throne of the kingdom, and commanding and writing and proclaiming with you as formerly."

Now when this saying was heard throughout the city, they assembled to stone Romulus with stones, because he had slain his brother. But he fled from them and went up to Athens. And when the philosopher Punitus (Pûnîtôs, Pônîtôs) heard of him, he went and listened to the words of Romulus, and promised him that if he would write for him Athens as a free city [*lit.* daughter of freemen, or of nobles], so that no king of the Romans should have authority over her, he would go to Rome and restore tranquillity to the sons of the city and to his powers. And he made a covenant with him that he would do that for him. And Punitus went to Rome and spoke with them, and said to them, "If ye will receive your king in peace, this earthquake will cease forthwith from your city, so that it shall not again quake. But if ye do not receive him your whole city will perish." And forthwith all the sons of Rome assembled and went up after their king to Athens. And when they had arrived [there], and had come [back] and reached Rome (Rômî), the whole city went out to receive him; and they answered and said to him, "If it be that you know that by your entrance into the city the quaking will cease from it, come, enter in glory and honor, and sit on the throne of your kingdom. But if the earthquake will not cease from us, do not enter." But he promised them, "This earthquake will cease from the city."

And the same philosopher made an image of gold after the likeness of his brother, and seated it with him upon the throne of his kingdom. And he commanded them that whatever was done or written should be as if from the mouth of the two. And they did so, and forthwith the earthquake ceased from the city. Thus by the wisdom of this man that earthquake ceased, and the inhabitants with their king were tranquillized. And thenceforward the Romans fixed that it should be the custom to write and command, saying [*i.e.* in the form], "We command." And Athens received freedom from that time on, that no king should have authority over her to do in her anything by force. And this same Armellus (Romulus) instituted an equestrian display (ippîqton, a corruption of ἱππικὸν) for [the] amusement [of the people], and he instituted the *martius*, and he was the first to institute the *veneti*[1] and the *prasini*[1]; for because he was afraid of the sons . . .[2]

[1] An anachronistic reference to colors worn in the hippodrome.

[2] A word or more defaced. Perhaps "of Rome, that they" is to be supplied.

Digitized by Google

would kill him as he had kiiled his brother, he established before him two men that hated each other, one from the *veneti* and one from the *prasini;* for, said he, "If it be that the *veneti* plot against me, the *prasini* will make it known to me; and if the *prasini* plot against me, the *veneti* will make it known to me" . . .[1] two men before . . .[1] of the city as if for amusement. And he clothed the one of the *veneti* in clothing of the sea, and the other in clothing of the *prasini*, which was like the grass of the earth. And he said, "If indeed this one conquers that is clothed like the *veneti*, the sea will be quieted, and the barbarians will not invade and obtain authority in the islands of the sea; as regards them that dwell in the sea, these will take the victory, and those that dwell on the dry [land] will be conquered. But if, again, he that is clothed like the *prasini* conquers, they that dwell on the dry [land] will conquer, and subdue those that dwell in the seas." And forthwith as these two men advanced to contend one with the other, those that dwelt in the sea prayed that the [one of the] *veneti* might win, but those that dwelt on the dry [land], that the [one of the] *prasini* might win. And from that time even until now there have been these two divisions of the kingdom of the Romans, of the *veneti* and the *prasini*. And Armellus (Romulus) instituted the *brumalia*, because he was a man that loved instruction, and that loved amusement, and that loved the youth; and he commanded that in the days of winter men should be calling one upon another, and that many should assemble, assembling with one, and should eat and drink and enjoy themselves. And he commanded that the letters of the alphabet should be coming in one after another, and every one of them should be called in its day. And they called them [*i.e.* those days] *brumalia*, which is, interpreted in the Greek language, "Let us eat and drink off others," that is *gratis*. And there was . . .[2] a grade of nobility at Rome, and he gave to the nobles the great honor of a throne and authority, that they should command and be obeyed. And he ordained that there should be *qûblarê* (cubi[cu]larii?) in the kingdom of the Romans, that is, that they should be servants in the kingdom. And he sent to Athens and brought thence the philosophers GLSOS (or GLSUS, Gelasus, Glesus, or -sys?) and LThROS (or –US, Lathrus, Lathyrus, Lathrys, etc.?), and made them an organ, that they might be delighted with beautiful sounds. And Armellus (Romulus) instituted the *katâdromôn*, and commanded that when the sons of Rome were assembled at the capitol the boys should go down by a rope from the top of the capitol to the bottom, sitting on a wheel and offering a crown to the kingdom, just as if a heroic crown were going down to [the place] of Nimrod, and that the kings should be givers of gifts to those little boys when they returned to come up again. And again he ordained that the Romans should take turns, that in order that they might be supported all the winter, so in the summer they should be going forth to war against their enemies. And he ordained and established *veredi* (*i.e.* post-couriers or post-horses), to serve as relays and bring news to the kings from the armies. And the day in which the Romans went out to war and called it *martius*,[3] also interpreted victory . . .[4] and . . .[4] great marvels and various deeds and excellent laws and upright commands he executed and established in Rome

[1] Words defaced.
[2] A word or more defaced.
[3] Perhaps the month of March (Martius) is meant.
[4] Some words defaced.

Digitized by Google

(Rômi). Among all the Romans there was no man like him excelling in all knowledge and wisdom, nor so honored by those that have understanding. And in his intellect he was so rich that whosoever saw him and spoke with him was discovered, the bad from the good and the false from the true . . .

At 9 P. M. the Association adjourned to meet at 8.30 A. M., Thursday.

EASTON, PA., Thursday, July 11, 1889.

MORNING SESSION.

Professor Seymour, the President, called the Association to order at 8.30 A. M.

The report of the Committee to nominate Officers was presented by L. H. Elwell, Esq., and adopted. In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee, the following gentlemen were elected officers of the Association for 1889–90: —

President, Professor Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Vice-Presidents, Dr. Julius Sachs, New York, N. Y., and Professor John H. Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Secretary and Curator, Dr. Herbert Weir Smyth, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Treasurer, Dr. Herbert Weir Smyth.

Additional members of the *Executive Committee*, —

Professor Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Professor Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Professor Bernadotte Perrin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
Professor William D. Whitney, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The Committee appointed to propose Time and Place for the next meeting reported, through Professor Peck, that invitations had been received to hold the meeting in 1890 at Norwich, Conn., Northampton, Mass., and Princeton, N. J. The Committee recommended that the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting be held on the second Tuesday in July, 1890, at Norwich, Conn.

The report was accepted and adopted.

On motion, the matter of effecting a union of meetings between the Modern Language Association and the Association was referred to the Executive Committee to report at the Norwich meeting.

The report of the Committee to audit the Treasurer's Accounts was presented by Dr. H. W. Smyth, to the effect that the accounts, with the accompanying vouchers, had been examined and found correct.

Digitized by Google

14. John Reuchlin and the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum*, by Morris H. Stratton, Esq., of Salem, N. J.

The object of this paper was to call attention again to the fact that the great contest between the monks of Cologne and John Reuchlin was really an attempt to smother classical literature in its cradle.

The facts and dates given were taken from the printed "Case" of the trial at Rome, of the appeal of Hoogstraten, the Inquisitor at Cologne, from the judgment of the Bishop of Spires — which appeal was decided in favor of Reuchlin in 1516 — and from the letters of Pirkheimer, Erasmus, and others, printed in Van der Hardt's *Historia Litteraria Reformationis.* Luther's letters to Reuchlin, also printed by Van der Hardt, fully and frankly acknowledge how much the Reformer owed to the Scholar who had preceded him.

The *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* were quoted to show that the first attack of the mendicant monks — in which they were fatally worsted and the back of the Inquisition was broken — was against the revival of classical literature as such. These letters are, of course, a satire, but the well-known facts as to the reception of them — even by their unconscious victims — prove that they were thoroughly verisimilar if not true.

Reuchlin and Erasmus opened the doors to the study of the Testaments in the original tongues, but that they were opposed as scholars and not as disseminators of a wider knowledge of the Bible was illustrated, *inter alia*, by the fact that among the hundreds of editions of the Bible in modern tongues issued in the Fifteenth Century, a very fine folio Bible, in the local German, with illustrations, was published in Cologne, between 1470 and 1475, without objection from Hoogstraten, and that Koburger published a superb illustrated Bible at Nuremburg, known as the *ninth* German Bible, in 1483 — the year in which Luther was born.

Reference was made to the great services of Ulrich von Hutten, one of the editors of the *Epistolae*, and the author of the "*Triumphus Capnionis.*" Sir Wm. Hamilton defends Hutten's authorship of the *Triumphus* — and from this the fact that he was one of the three editors of the *Epistolae* — with great learning and ability in an article on the *Epistolae* and their authorship, in the Edinburg Review of March, 1831; and Van der Hardt assumes it as unquestioned that Hutten wrote the *Triumphus.* This savage satire is referred to, however, by Henry Charles Lea, in his *History of the Inquisition* — Vol. II. pp. 424–25 — as written by Eleutherius Bizenus, Hutten's *nom de plume.*

The inaccurate and misleading account of Reuchlin and of his contest with the monks, in the work referred to, was given as one of the reasons for writing this paper.

Professor Francis A. March, as Chairman of the Committee on the Reform of English Spelling, reported that no action had been taken during the last year. The manual dictionary with amended spellings has not yet been made.

A report was made April 8, 1889, by the Commission on Amended Orthography authorized by the Legislature of Pennsylvania. The Commission askt aid from the American Philosophical Society, Super-

Digitized by Google

intendents of Education, and others, and the printed report contains, as appendixes, elaborate arguments in favor of reform by a committee of the American Philosophical Society, and by Hon. W. T. Harris, U. S. Commissioner of Education, with various statistics.

The practical recommendation of the Commission is as follows: —

The Commission would call attention to the fact that many words are spelt in two ways in our dictionaries, and that it is therefore necessary for a choice to be made between the different spellings. We find "honor" and "honour," "traveller" and "traveler," "comptroller" and "controller," and hundreds of such pairs. In these words one way of spelling is better than the other on grounds of reason, simpler, more economical, more truthful to sound etymology and scientific law.

The Commission respectfully submits that the regulation of the orthography of the public documents is of sufficient importance to call for legislative action, and recommends that the public printer be instructed, whenever variant spellings of a word are found in the current dictionaries, to use in the public documents the simpler form which accords with the amended spelling recommended by the joint action of the American Philological Association and the English Philological Society.

FRANCIS A. MARCH,
THOMAS CHASE,
H. L. WAYLAND,
ARTHUR BIDDLE,
JAS. W. WALK,
SAMUEL A. BOYLE.

Professor W. D. Whitney, in the preface to the *Century Dictionary*, May 1st, 1889, takes similar ground: "The language is struggling toward a more consistent and phonetic spelling, and it is proper, in disputed and doubtful cases, to cast the influence of the dictionary in favor of this movement, both by its own usage in the body of the text, and at the head of articles by the order of forms, or the selection of the form under which the word shall be treated."

The report was accepted, and the Committee appointed in 1875 was continued for another year. It now consists of Messrs. March (Chairman), Child, Lounsbury, Price, Trumbull, and Whitney.

15. A Northumbrianized Judith Text, with Commentary, by Professor Albert S. Cook, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; read by Professor F. A. March.

16. Stressed Vowels in Ælfric's Homilies (late West Saxon), by Professor Albert S. Cook, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; read by Professor F. A. March.

On motion of Professor A. F. West, a resolution was adopted as follows: —

Digitized by Google

The American Philological Association desires to place on record, before finally adjourning, the hearty expression of its thanks to the President and Faculty of Lafayette College for the use of the various college buildings, to the Local Committee of Arrangements and its Chairman, Professor Owen (of Lafayette), to the Committee of the gentlemen of Easton for the very pleasant excursion taken under their guidance to Paxinosa, and to the newspapers of Easton for their full and accurate reports of the proceedings of the Association.

17. The Study of English in Preparation for College, by Professor Francis A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

Accurate knowledge of the mother tung is fundamental to all valuabl thinking. It is to be obtaind by studying classic English authors substantially in the same way that Greek is studied in good schools: that is to say, by studying each word etymologically and in its connection so as to comprehend its meaning, and by studying each clause and sentence in its connection so as to repeat the train of thought of the author. This study should be recognized as different from reading literature for plesure or for esthetic or bibliografic culture. The paper discust the desirablness of a general agreement among the colleges upon some two or three English books of moderate size for the entrance examinations, to be put on the same footing as the Anabasis and Iliad in Greek. Franklin's Autobiography and two books of Paradise Lost wer suggested. If they wer generally adopted, editions would be prepared for study of the right sort by the most accomplisht professors, and a tradition of good teaching of them would soon be establisht in the fitting schools.

Remarks were made by Messrs. W. D. Shipman, T. Peck, J. Sachs, T. R. Price, and F. A. March.

18. The Relation of the Greek Optative to the Subjunctive and the other Moods, by Professor William W. Goodwin, of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; read by Professor J. H. Wright.

This paper has appeared in the new (1890) edition, of Professor Goodwin's Greek Moods and Tenses, Appendix I.

19. A New Source in Plutarch's Life of Cicero, by Dr. A. Gudeman, of New York, N. Y.

After some introductory remarks on the method to be followed in investigations of this nature, on the inherent difficulties to be encountered, on Plutarch's mode of work and on the degree of proficiency in Latin which we may safely assume him to have attained, the lecturer briefly reviews the authors usually regarded as the chief sources of the Greek life. The investigations hitherto made have, however, been almost entirely confined to ascertaining the sources of Plutarch's narrative of Cicero's *political history*, and, in consequence, but slight attention was paid to the "Quellen" of those portions of the vita which deal more particularly with the personal and literary side of the great orator. Tiro's voluminous life of his patron was generally supposed to have furnished Plutarch with the bulk of his purely biographical material, while Cicero's autobiographical

Digitized by Google

writings, as well as Augustus' memoirs, were considered as secondary sources.[1] All the writers, however, that have been suggested as the original sources of Plutarch's narrative were either contemporary with Cicero or nearly so. That the Greek historian may also have consulted much later authorities has not, as far as I am aware, ever been hinted at. It is the object of this paper to show: 1. That Plutarch actually made use of *one*, or, if you will, several *post-Augustan* writers. 2. That one of these post-Augustan sources is no other than *Suetonius. Tranquillus' Life of Cicero*, which formed a part of his famous work De viris illustribus.

The first of these propositions is conclusively demonstrated by ch. 2 of the Life, containing a criticism of Cicero's poetical abilities.[2] The beginning of ch. 40, and a few other passages, also point to a post-Augustan source.

The proof for the second thesis is furnished by ch. III, 11 sqq. This passage contains two *misstatements* of such a nature as to exclude Tiro, Nepos, Fenestella, etc., as their possible authors. We can only attribute them to a writer remote enough in point of time to render the error excusable. Who can this be? The identical error is fortunately found in *two* other authors, and in *only two*, besides Plutarch, and their names are *Hieronymus* and *Sextus Aurelius Victor*. Now, one of the sources of Hieronymus (as has never been denied) and of Victor's De viris illustribus (as can be shown) is Suetonius' work of the same name. The erroneous statements in question, therefore, not being met with elsewhere, and remembering how much safer a clue to inter-dependence of authors is afforded by coincidences of palpable errors than by concurrences in well-known facts, it follows that Suetonius is the common source of Plutarch, Aurelius Victor, and Hieronymus.

This new source having once been discovered, we are at liberty to look for other statements whose origin we had been hitherto unable to determine with any degree of probability. A number of such passages having a genuine color Suetonianus, ch. 2, quoted above, being among these, is accordingly pointed out as being very probably derived from Suetonius' vita; and taken altogether, they certainly possess all the argumentative validity of strong cumulative evidence.

The paper concludes by the author's disposing of a possible *chronological* objection to Suetonius as a source of Plutarch, by showing that the vita Ciceronis was written later than 115 A.D., this year being the *terminus post quem* of the composition of the Life of Sulla (cf. ch. 21), which in its turn preceded Plutarch's vitae of Demosthenes and Cicero, as Michaelis has convincingly proven. Suetonius' work must have been in the hands of the public long before this time, the author being then past the age of forty.

20. On the Use of Verbs of Saying in the Platonic Dialogues, by Dr. George B. Hussey, of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.[3]

This paper points out the various forms of verbs of saying used by Plato, and passes on to show that some of them belong exclusively to the later periods of his literary activity. The fact that almost all Plato's writings are in the form of dialogues suffices of itself to explain his frequent use of verbs of saying. Thus the Protagoras has 565 instances of them, and the Phaedrus over 320. Some of these

[1] Strange to say, it has never occurred to any one that Plutarch might possibly be indebted to Nepos' Life of Cicero (mentioned by Gellius XV, 28, 1) for some details. But cf. Transactions, Vol. XX. [2] For the proof itself I refer to Transac. Vol. XX.

[3] Published in full in Am. Journ. Philol. Vol. X.

Digitized by Google

verbs may depend for their use entirely on the external features of the dialogue. In the indirect dialogues — those where the argument is related to persons not present at it — the phrases ἦ δ' ὅς, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἔφην, ἔφη make up the greater part of the verbs of saying.

If such verbs as belong to the narrative of the indirect dialogues are set aside, the remaining instances exhibit much more variety of form. They serve chiefly to introduce quotations of all sorts. So proverbs are usually introduced by τὸ λεγόμενον, myths and traditions by λέγεται, and opinions of poets and philosophers by λέγει, φησί, or some other form in the active third person. Another use of these verbs of saying (and the one to which attention is especially called) occurs where one of the speakers quotes an earlier part of the dialogue he is engaged in, or even a preceding dialogue. When the statement referred to is near at hand or is quite prominent, a present tense, as λέγεις, φῄς, may be used in citing it, but when more distant a past tense ἔλεγον, ἐρρήθη, τὰ λεχθέντα is more frequent. It is among citations consisting of past passive forms that the gradual extension of use can be best observed. Some of them seem to be known only to Plato's later style, and by means of them the dialogues can be arranged in the following series, which probably corresponds somewhat closely with the order in which they were composed: —

	1. Total References.	2. Per cent of ἐρρήθη and ῥηθείς.	3. Cases of ἐρρήθη and ῥηθείς.	4. Cases of ἐλέχθη and λεχθείς.	5. Cases of προερρήθη, προείρηται, and their Participles.	6. Cases of λεχθείς and λεχθείσα as an Adjective.	7. Cases of the Perfect Passive of λέγω.
Apology	7	..	..	..	..	..	..
Crito	11	..	..	..	..	..	..
Euthyphro	10	..	..	..	..	..	..
Protagoras	26	..	..	..	..	..	..
Euthydemus	29	..	..	..	..	..	..
Laches	17	..	..	..	..	..	..
Charmides	18	..	..	1	..	..	..
Meno	16	..	..	1	..	..	..
Lysis	13	..	..	1	..	..	..
Parmenides	16	..	..	1	..	..	..
Cratylus	34	..	..	1	1	..	..
Hippias II	13	..	..	2	2	..	..
Republic (bks. I–V)	109	1.8	2	2	3	..	..
Gorgias	76	2.6	2	0	0	..	..
Phaedo	40	5.0	2	1	4	..	..
Symposium	29	6.9	2	1	1	..	..
Phaedrus	39	10.2	4	4	0	..	..
Republic (bks. VI–X)	80	8.7	7	3	9	..	..
Theaetetus	47	10.6	5	1	0	..	..
Sophist	65	9.2	6	7	1	1	..
Philebus	93	10.7	10	9	4	2	..
Timaeus	39	20.4	8	6	1	1	2
Politicus	88	26.1	23	11	2	5	1
Laws	324	11.1	36	26	5	10	3

Digitized by Google

	Dittenberger.	Schanz.
I.	Crito.	Apology.
	Euthyphro.	Euthyphro.
	Protagoras.	Gorgias.
	Charmides.	Laches.
	Laches.	Lysis.
	Hippias II.	Protagoras.
	Euthydemus.	Symposium.
	Meno.	Phaedo.
	Gorgias.	Phaedrus.
	Cratylus.	Cratylus.
	Phaedo.	Euthydemus.
II.	Symposium.	Theaetetus.
	Lysis.	epublic.
	Phaedrus.	Sophist.
	Republic.	Philebus.
	Theaetetus.	Politicus.
	Parmenides.	Timaeus.
	Philebus.	Laws.
	Sophist.	
	Politicus.	
	Laws.	

In determining the frequency of any form of citation in such different dialogues as the Gorgias and Timaeus the total number of references is a much fairer measure than the number of pages covered by each dialogue. These totals are shown in the first column of the table. They are made up solely of references to statements of persons engaged in the discussion, and are, besides, limited to past tenses of the indicative and to past participles of the verbs λέγω, ἐρῶ, εἶπον, and φημί. The tenses of the infinitive and imperative are omitted, as when used in a past tense they are not always references to a preceding passage. The second column shows what percentage of these citations is formed by ἐρρήθη and its participle ῥηθείς, and the third gives the absolute number of these special forms. The fourth column shows the cases of ἐλέχθη and λεχθείς when used as citations; and the next does the same for προερρήθη, προείρηται, and their participles. A peculiar and harsh construction of λεχθείς, as an adjective qualifying a noun of masculine or feminine gender, is shown in the sixth column. Cases of the rare perfect passive of λέγω are given in the last column. Some of these, however, are imperatives, and it should be remarked that the last two columns are not restricted to citations, but include all instances of the forms mentioned.

It will be seen that the first six dialogues do not show any of the forms given in the table. They can, therefore, only be put into a group by themselves; while their relations to one another within it have to be left undetermined. The next few dialogues in the series owe their position to the fact that they begin to show instances of ἐλέχθη. Then, when ἐρρήθη begins, it is chosen as a criterion; and finally the λεχθείς-construction, shown in the sixth column, becomes the test-word. Thus the early stages of each usage are considered to be most important, as it is then that the employment of the special word is most a matter of conscious effort. The columns containing προερρήθη and λέλεκται have, in general, a tendency to confirm the evidence of the others; but, except for this, are not of so much importance in fixing the order of the dialogues. The most natural explanation of these new forms of citation that appear in the later dialogues, but do not exclude

Digitized by Google

earlier words used for the same purpose, is that they were introduced for the sake of variety.

Dittenberger in Hermes, XVI, 321, and Schanz in the same periodical, XXI, 439, have already used a similar method of arranging the dialogues by means of changes in the use of words. Certain phrases containing μήν were used for this purpose by Dittenberger, and, except for the position of the Lysis and Parmenides, the present list agrees very closely with his results. According to his investigations the Lysis ought to be placed near the Phaedrus and the Parmenides near the Philebus. Their fluctuating position would thus seem to be another proof that they are not genuine Platonic dialogues.

21. The Quality of Sanskrit *a-kāra*, by Professor Edward W. Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; read by L. H. Elwell, Esq.

It seems to me time to put the formal question: Do we mean what we write when we transcribe the Sanskrit vowel usually rendered *a* by this symbol? As we know that there was a period in which the language had short *ŏ* and *ĕ* (of whatever source), and find neither of these represented in the alphabet; as we know also that there was a period when a single vowel sound represented all that was left of *ă*, *ĕ*, *ŏ*, we may for convenience' sake divide the growth of the whole language into two periods, Early and Late, approximately the time of the Rig Veda and of Pāṇini respectively.

For the early period we have (see Bloomfield in the third volume of the Am. Journ.), already given, the fact that short *ĕ* and *ŏ* existed. To the late period no such vowels were known. It is important to bear in mind that the alphabet arises between the two periods here designated.

One of the short vowels of the earlier period is *ŏ*, said to be developed from *'a's*. As this *ŏ*, however, corresponds to the short *o* of related languages in *os*, it is evident that its apparent derivation from *as* assumes (what is in this case not yet proved) that we have here (*'a's*) a real *a*, and not a letter subsequently to develop into *'a'*. The assumption of Oldenberg, that we have here *as* = *ŏ* = *au*, with a vanishing semivowel after the vowel, is based on examples that prove only the felt want of some sign to express the lost consonant which can have been nothing but *s*. The peculiar examples of *'a's* = *ay* given Hymnen s. 457 show only a half-remembered consonant expressed, by analogy, by the semivowel; for there can be absolutely no historical sense in *apay isya*, *abhibhūyamānay iva*, etc. In *Indrŏ 'bravīt* from *indrŏs* + vowel *'a'* we have a result to be compared with *Indrō nāma*; the *s* lost before sonant and the following vowel absorbed in one case (compare the accent); in the other the *s* dropped before sonant, but the consciousness of the two consonants producing length of the preceding vowel. For until we know that in this example of *'a'-kāra* we are dealing with a pure *'a'* it is right to assume the vowel sound indicated, even were it probable that *'a'sdhi* would remain contracted as *ĕdhi*, while *'a'sti* is *asti* (*ĕsdhi* becomes *ĕdhi*, hence for *asti* read *ĕsti*). Because the later alphabet gives us *s'a'd* we assume *sad* and take *sēd* to be contracted from *sasad* rather than *sĕsĕd*, though this alphabet on which we rest our belief does not really give us *sad*, as I shall now show, but *s* + *doubtful vowel* + *d* (I am aware that the primitive origin of *sēd*, etc., is called in question by Bar-

Digitized by Google

tholomae, but the example will serve as an illustration of our present transcription). Were it not for a future alphabet which writes *ĕ*, *ŏ*, *ă*, in their further development with one sign (this which we write *a* and which I will call *akar*), we should not think of assuming that the *ĕ*, *ŏ*, *ă*, of the Veda were all one sound as they actually become later. For if we prove *ŏ* from *'a's* and see no alphabetical distinction between *ŏ* and *ō*, we may conclude that the alphabet is responsible for slurring other sounds also. It is then of the highest importance to know what *akar* is in the Sanskrit alphabet of the late period. Moreover, we are entitled to look to the neighboring dialects and see whether our alphabet is not later than the forms they give. In Pali our *akar* is represented by both *ĕ* and *ŏ*, and it is no explanation to say that this is the result of a later closed pronunciation of *a* (see Ind. Stud. iv. 119). Our ending of the plural verb *m'a's* is represented by *mŭ;* the instrumental *rāj'a'bhis* by *ŭbhi*, or *ĕbhi; dharm'a's*, by *dhammŏ; pitrā*, by *pitarā* or *pitunā; j'a'y'a'ti* by *jeti*, etc. If we turn to Zend we find also, near as it stands to Sanskrit compared with other tongues, Sanskrit *akar* represented by *ĕ* as well as by *ă*; the nominatives, as in Pali, *aspo*, *mano;* possibly the diphthong *oi* for *ai* (*toi*). It would be extraordinary to have Zend and Pali agree rather with Greek than with Sanskrit in giving *o* as the nom. sg. in *aspo*, etc. We write *a* for *akar* because the later alphabet demands — not *a* — but one vowel in all cases. What then is this vowel of the later period? Different vowels passed into one sound as in Greece. Three reasons show that in the second or late period this vowel was not an *a*. First, the oral tradition, that tradition which made the early Sanskrit scholars write not Manu but Menu, etc.; second, this traditional pronunciation is upheld by Pāṇini, at whose time we may loosely set the uniform stage, who says distinctly that the sound which he treats as open *a* is in reality a closed *a*. Now a closed *a* cannot be transcribed by *a*, but rather by *ŏ* or *ŭ* if we would render its quality correctly, and not violate truth by adherence to Pāṇini's self-confessed inaccuracy. Third, the Greek inscriptions show clearly that tradition and Pāṇini's confession bear witness to truth, for here we find that *akar*, far from being transcribed as a pure *a*, is rendered by Greek *o*, by *ε*, or even by *ι* and *υ*, as well as by *α* (see Weber's collection Ind. Ant. ii. 143 ff.). Now if we find the norm of a pure *a* earlier than Pāṇini (Vāj. Pr.), we may assume a chronological better than geographical difference, especially as the close *a* (*ŏ*, *ŭ*) seems to be found in various districts.

In this second period (to the beginning of which the alphabet must be referred) we find but one sign for the earlier *ă*, *ĕ*, *ŏ*, and this sign is not really an *a*, but an *ŏ* or *ŭ*. What right have we, therefore, to insist on a pure *a* being the universal representative of this *akar* for the earlier period? Undoubtedly *akar* often represents a pure *a* because its later function embraces a pure *a* in a plurality of cases (as in words whose vowels = *a*, *aj*, etc.); but on the other hand, it often does not, as far as we can see; nor is there any reason to think so except given by this same alphabet. The separate existence of *ă*, *ĕ*, *ŏ*, ceased before this alphabet began, becoming the "mid-back narrow *a*," i.e. *o* in come, *u* in but. In transcribing *akar* by *a* we therefore fail to give rightly the sound of the second period, and ignore the fact that in the early period it would have been divided (had an alphabet existed) into *ĕ*, *ŏ*, *ă*, which three vowels occur, but could of course leave no trace except by inference. Our norm for the early period must necessarily be doubtful in cases where no light is given from without. But where

Digitized by Google

a comparison of Zend, Pali, and Greek show *o* against an assumed Sanskrit '*a's*, we ought certainly to make a distinction that is based on comparative forms and upheld by native texts; writing instead of *as*, *ŏs*: and we should probably not be wrong if we extended this distinct pronunciation into other cases where *ŏs* or *ĕs* can be predicated from native dialects in conjunction with Zend, itself nothing but an Aryan dialect a little further removed. But to keep on writing Sanskrit *a* = *α*, *ε*, *ο*, is certainly incorrect both for the early and the late period. In one case '*a*' does not fill the requirements; in the other it contradicts a pronunciation that is proved to have been different. We might as well write *ει* = i in Greek because it came to be pronounced so in the course of centuries.

22. The Phonology of the Ionic Dialect, by Dr. Herbert Weir Smyth, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Though the Ionic dialect contains so generous a wealth of linguistic phenomena and stands in such intimate relations with the history of Hellenic thought, investigators have not yet taken possession of that precious legacy of opportunity bequeathed by Ahrens to his successors. A few scattered treatises dealing with Ionic is the total output of the half-century following upon the publication of the *De Graecae linguae dialectis.*

This paper gave a brief abstract of the results of a somewhat detailed examination of the vowel and the consonantal system of Ionic from the advent of the elegy to the period of the Sophistic Renaissance.

As to the field surveyed, so far as the inscriptions are concerned, I have endeavored to utilize every form pertinent to a knowledge of Ionic phonology. Whenever it was necessary to compare the date of any phonetic change in Ionic with the date of a similar change in Attic, I have drawn the latter dialect into the range of vision. Of the lyric poets, especial attention has been devoted to those of Ionic birth (Archilochos, Simonides Amorginus, Hipponax, Ananios, Kallinos, Mimnermos, Xenophanes, and Phokylides); and I have treated in detail the dialect of Tyrtaios, Solon, and Theognis: Tyrtaios, a Lakonian by adoption, but a representative of the early Ionic elegy; Solon, in order to test the question how far his Muse is Ionic, how far Old-Attic; and Theognis, that we may obtain a complete survey of the language of the elegy down to the end of the sixth century. Herodotos I have examined with special reference to the interrelation of the Mss., and trust that but few points have been overlooked, though I am but too well aware how difficult it is to reach completeness in so wide a field. For the language of the philosophers, Anaxagoras of Klazomenai, Diogenes of Apollonia, Melissos of Samos, Herakleitos of Ephesos, have been investigated; and for the older medical dialect, those writings of Hippokrates which are least open to the suspicion of spuriousness. Of the pseudo-Ionists, Aretaios' Αἰτίαι, Arrian's Ἰνδική, and Lukian's *Syrian Goddess* and *Astronomy*[1] are easily our chief sources; but I have placed under contribution the fragments of Abydenos' Assyrian History, Eusebios, and Eusebios Myndios, that we may realize the more vividly how persistent has been the influence exercised upon later prose by the Ionic dialect. The testimony of Gregory of Corinth has been adduced throughout.

[1] Even if the *Astronomy* should not prove to be the genuine work of Lukian, it is still invaluable as a testimony to the character of the pseudo-Ionism of the age of Hadrian.

Digitized by Google

From the point of view of the dialectologist, the history of Hellenic speech falls into four divisions: —

Period of primitive Greek.
Period of the life of single dialects.
Period of the contest of the Attic κοινή with the Doric κοινά.
Period of the existence of a universal κοινή.

Within the confines of the second period, Ionic is, broadly speaking, the dialect of the literary world from the eighth century until it was driven from its commanding position by Attic. Taken as a whole, Ionic presents in its structure a uniformity far more consistent than that possessed by Doric. It is upon the evidence of the inscriptions alone that we are enabled to assert the existence of subdivisions, which mark the course of Ionic emigration from the mainland of Greece. These sub-dialects are: I. Ionic of Euboia and colonies. II. Ionic of the Kyklades. III. Ionic of Asia Minor and of the adjacent islands and their colonies.

I. Western Ionic is the dialect of Euboia and colonies (Chalkis, Kyme, Olynthos, Amphipolis, Eretria, Oropos, Styra). It still possesses the rough breathing; names derived from κλέος terminate in -κλέης, not in -κλῆς; the genitive of proper names whose second component part is an -ι stem, ends in -ιδος, not in -ιος. These peculiarities and certain others (ει < ηι, οι < ωι, and cases of ττ for σσ) testify to what an extent the political supremacy of Athens has succeeded in coloring the speech of the rear-guard of Ionism. When Western Ionic differs from the Ionic of the other divisions, it differs by its preference for Attic forms, save in its possession of rhotacism, found nowhere else upon Ionic territory, and whose ultimate provenance is still a matter of dispute. Another point of isolation is that Western Ionic alone produced no literature. Whatever artistic capacity the Euboians possessed tended in the direction of the manufacture of vases.

II. Island Ionic has -κλῆς, not -κλέης; -ιος, not -ιδος. Retaining the rough breathing, which is well attested in the case of the Parian Archilochos, Island Ionic thus forms a bridge between Western and Eastern Ionic. Up to the present time, no mint-marks of local difference can be observed in the speech of the various islands, and the sole ground for a separation into two sections, (I) Naxos, Keos; (2) Delos, Paros, Siphnos, is a difference in the writing of η = I.E. ē and η = I.E. ā. But at best this palaeographic distinction, which seems to betoken a difference in pronunciation, does not hold good for all time, having been retained a century longer by the first group than by the second.

III. The chief characteristic of Eastern Ionic is the displacement of the rough breathing at a very early period. The inscriptions speak with no uncertain voice against the existence of the *spiritus asper* save in compounds; and literature confirms this testimony to a considerable extent. Asiatic Ionic, like that of the Kyklades, has -κλῆς and -ιος.

There doubtless existed sub-dialects of Eastern Ionic, but the accuracy of the Herodotean division is not yet attested by the monuments under our control.

The language of the inscriptions alone is not an absolute criterion of the genuineness of an Ionic form unless the inscription is older than 400 B.C. and contains no trace of what is specifically Attic. When the language of the inscriptions, with this limitation, agrees with that of the poets, we have the surest criterion of the

Digitized by Google

Ionic character of the form in question that is possible under the circumstances; and against this evidence the fluctuating orthography of Herodotean and Hippokratean Mss. can make no stand.

As in the domain of thought, so in that of language, the elegy occupies a different field from iambic poetry. Upon the dividing line of the frequency of adoption of Homeric forms, we may separate Theognis from the earlier elegists. In its possession of legacies from the earliest Ionic period, and in its use of Homeric Aiolisms, the dialect of the Megarian poet stands in closer touch with the language of the epic period than does the idiom of any of his predecessors of the elegiac guild.

Now there is a wide chasm between the Aiolisms of the earlier elegy and the adventitious Aiolisms of Chios. The latter are distinctively prose forms, the former are only such as had been consecrated to use by the epos. Here we must clearly grasp two facts: (1) that an elegiac poet could adopt only Homeric Aiolisms, and (2) that no elegiac poet, not of Ionic birth, could borrow from a genuine Ionian, forms that are specifically Ionic. Solon has his Atticisms, Tyrtaios and Theognis their Dorisms, but they may not use forms that are specifically Ionic. Our inscriptions show that what is not Homeric in the elegy is drawn from the soil whence the elegy sprang; and that the forms taken from the living speech of the poet's time are few in comparison to those found in iambic poetry.

If the language of the iambographers has but little love for archaic Ionisms, it has still less for Aiolisms. The language of Archilochos, Simonides of Amorgos, and Hipponax, is, with due allowance for the perverse influence of copyists who had the Attic norm in their mind's eye, practically the same as that of the inscriptions.

In great part the language of Herodotos is supported by that of the inscriptions, and much of what is genuine Ionic in Herodotos is also Attic. Many forms which occur nowhere else outside of Herodotos find an easy explanation in the laws of Greek morphology. Of the remaining forms, aside from the out-and-out barbarisms, one part was obsolescent, another, and the larger part, obsolete, at the time the genius of the Ionic race created literary prose.

In the course of the following investigation my primary purpose has been to let the facts themselves show how great is the difference existing between what is certainly Ionic of the fifth century and what is ordinarily proclaimed as Ionic of the fifth century upon the authority of Herodotean Mss. While I do not deny that Herodotos may have adopted forms that are specifically Homeric in passages that are strongly tinged with an epic tone, nevertheless my survey of the evidence has led me to the conclusion that the original text of Herodotos was written in the dialect of his time, while the bulk of the variations from that dialect is due to a *μεταχαρακτηρισμός*, which I would place about the first century of our era.

In the history of Greek literature *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* proceeded on two lines: either in the direction of Atticizing the dialect texts, a fact vouched for by Galen as usual in his time, or in the direction of the substitution of dialect forms in the light of contemporaneous dialectological theories. The text of Alkman, of Korinna, and, to a lesser extent, that of Pindar, bear witness to the activity of the *μεταγραφόμενοι* in the latter direction.

The writers of the Hadrianic age who imitated Herodotos and Hippokrates have received the full shock of this wave of speculation as regards Ionic. But

Digitized by Google

from the point of view of higher criticism, the "pseudo-Ionisms" of Lukian and Aretaios are on a different footing from the same forms in Stein's or Holder's text of Herodotos. In the one case they are the result of genuine imitation; in the other, these forms never existed in Herodotos.

A further estrangement from genuine Ionic was produced by the occasional insertion of such hyper-Ionic formation into the texts of these Ionists as are not found save in some Mss. of Herodotos.

One of the causes of this *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* was the inability of the dialectologists to distinguish between the Ionic of the Homeric period and the Ionic of the fifth century. It was all Ionic Greek to these sciolists. The cardinal error of the *μεταγραψάμενοι* was the foisting of uncontracted forms upon Herodotos. This was caused by inability to distinguish between those vocalic combinations that normally remained uncontracted and those which by the fifth century had suffered contraction, and by their failing to recognize that *εο* and *εω*, even if written in the uncontracted form, had frequently become diphthongal as early as the seventh century. Evidence is adduced that this *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* has not affected alike all the early writers in Ionic, and that upon the authority of good Mss. the original form may very often be reinstated.

23. The Enchantment of "Grammar," by Dr. C. P. G. Scott, of New York, N. Y.

In the absence of the author, the following paper was read by title: —

24. Sex-Denoting Nouns in American Languages, by Albert S. Gatschet, Esq., of the United States Bureau of Ethnology, Washington, D. C.

When primitive populations attempt to form grammatic distinctions of the objects which they see around themselves, they usually classify them into objects of the animate and objects of the inanimate order. Whether this distinction is made by adding a syllable or retrenching one, there is probably no language on the face of the earth that does not show some trace of this obvious and antique classification. It appears to have manifested itself at first in the pronominal parts of speech and from there spread into the verb and the noun. The various phases and aspects of this classifying process are also known to students of American languages as rational and irrational, noble and ignoble, arrhenic and metarrhenic, etc., as far as the noun is concerned, and are of great psychologic interest; the Algonkin dialects of the United States and Canada exhibit this distinction in a very obvious manner.

But besides the above, a distinction of sex was made in some languages, which either embraced all the objects of the animal creation or only the more important ones, viz.: persons, quadrupeds, and birds, the other animates being not distinguished for sex and relegated to the inanimate class. Abstract nouns adopted either the feminine or the inanimate gender.

The personal pronoun, especially the third person, is that part of speech where sex is *first* marked by separate grammatic signs, and from there it works its way

Digitized by Google

into the other pronouns. Sex may be denoted in *one* dialect of a linguistic family and not be distinguished in the others, as I have observed in the Kalapuya of Oregon. It exists in the pronoun of the third person in some Iroquois dialects, but not in the Cherokee, which is a cognate language. Even in Iroquois dialects it extends to persons only, not to animals. A beginning of sex-distinction is found in the pronoun of the Selish and Chinook dialects, in Yuchi and in Timucua, where o, oqe is *he*, ya: *she*. The large majority of American languages knows nothing of any such pronominal distinction; we do not find it in the Shoshonian, Algonkin, Maskoki, Kechua, and Tupi languages.

Sex-distinction is scarcer still in the *verb* of American languages than in the pronoun, though it could have easily made its way into this part of speech, wherever there is a real personal inflection or incorporation of the object into the verb. Something of the sort is observed in the verb of Chinook, at least in Klakamas, which is an Upper Chinook dialect I had the opportunity to study.

The *substantive* has resisted more than other parts of speech the adoption of formative affixes designating sex, and in most American languages such are wanting. In Maya dialects the appositions "male" and "female" have been ground down so as to represent mere prefixes, ah- for the male, ish-, sh-, for the female. A beginning of personification of inanimate objects in regard to sex is found in a few Indian terms. Thus, *Mississippi river* is called in Caddo: Báhat-sássin, the "Mother of rivers"; and *thumb* is in all the Maskoki dialects "of one's fingers their mother"; in Chicasa, ílbak íshke.

In the eastern hemisphere two stocks serve as examples of a well-developed system of sex-distinction: the Aryan and the Semito-Hamitic. In the former we find a large variety of modifications in this line, one of these being the total extinction of the neuter gender, which formerly represented the inanimate class, by the masculine and feminine in some of the *modern* dialects. In America sex-distinction in the noun has been found to occur only in two families, the Carib and the Tunica; but when a more profound study of all the American tongues will have been achieved, it may turn up in other languages also.

In the Carib family, the real seat of which is in South America, sex-denoting affixes have been studied in the Arowak, the Goajiro, and the Kalinago of the West Indies or Antillian islands. From Fr. Müller, *Grundriss* (vol. II), I quote the following instances of sex-inflection:

Arowak:	basabanti *boy*,	basabantu, *girl*.
	kansiti *loving* (man),	kansitu *loving* (woman).
	elonti *male child*,	elontu *female child*.
Goajiro:	anashi *good*,	fem. anase.
	oikari *merchant*,	fem. okare.
	maχuaíntchi *sorry*,	fem. maχuaínre.
Kalinago:	aparuti *murderer*,	fem. aparutu.
	ki^{n}shi^{n}ti *beloved*,	fem. ki^{n}shi^{n}tu.

These examples prove that the sex-suffixes extend over the adjective and participle, as well as over the substantive.

Sex-suffixes appear also in the *Taensa* language of Louisiana; but since this language is subject to some doubts of genuineness in the form as we have it now,

Digitized by Google

we have to remit the discussion over its sex-character to some future day. It is at all events a curious fact, that sex-suffixes appear here *in such close vicinity* to the Tunica, another language of Eastern Louisiana, *both* showing them in the *second* as well as in the *third* persons of the personal and possessive pronoun.

The *Tunica* or Tuniχka, discovered by me in the autumn of 1886, proved to represent a family heretofore unknown to science, and on account of its strange peculiarities deserves to be carefully studied and compared with other languages, especially with those once spoken in its immediate neighborhood, as Nā'htchi, Maskóki, Atákapa, and Shetimásha.

The masculine and feminine are the only genders existing in Tunica, for all inanimate objects belong to one of these two, and abstract nouns are of the feminine gender.

In nouns the masculine is marked in the singular by a prefix uk-, u-, or by a suffix -ku, -χku; the feminine by a prefix tik-, tí'h-, ti-, t-, or by a suffix -χtchi, -ktchi, -'htchi, -'htch, -tch, -ts. In the plural, the masculine nouns are made distinct by a prefix sik-, sig-, the feminine by sin-, si^{n}-, si-; these plural affixes appear also, but in rare instances only, as suffixes. These affixes are often dropped, but the feminine less frequently than the masculine affixes.

That these affixes are of a pronominal character and that some appear also as independent personal pronouns, may be gathered from the following table of pronouns:

íma *I*, ímata^{n} *myself.*
ma *thou* (masc.), hä'ma (fem.).
úwi *he*, tí'htchi *she;* emphatic: úwita^{n} *himself*, etc.
ínima *we*, inímata^{n} *ourselves.*
wínima *ye* (masc.), hínima (fem.).
sä'^{n}ma, sä'^{n} *they* (masc.), sínima, sí^{n} *they* (fem.).

The possessive pronouns are prefixed to the noun, and most of them are abbreviations from the above through retrenchment of -ma.

In the verb, the subject-pronoun is incorporated into its stem as a suffix of one or two syllables, which largely differs from the personal pronoun as quoted above.

In the sentence these suffixes appear as follows: —

kuá túχku óshka tádshara *the claws of a little bird.* Kuá *bird* being masculine, túχku or túχk, from tú *small*, assumes the suffix of that gender.
tóni sik'háyi *old people*, lit. "people — those — old."
tá riχkéku hárīa tá ri'tch atapä'ra *the tree is as tall as the house*, lit. "the tree — he tall the house — her equals." Tá is the article *the*, which is unchangeable as in English; ríχku means *tree*, ri *house.*
táχtchiksh tí'hkorak *full moon*, lit. "luminary she — round"; kóra meaning *round.*

As instances of the changes which adjectives are undergoing when subjected to the sex-denoting process and accompanied by their substantives, we offer the following: —

tä'^{n} *great, large,*	masc. tä'ku, tä'gu,	fem. tä'htchi.
méli *black,*	méliku, méliχku,	méliktchi.
rówa *white,*	rówaku,	rówaktch(i).
máka^{n} *fat,*	makáχku,	maká'htchi.
táχkir *smutty,*	táχkirku,	táχkiri'htch.

Digitized by Google

Substantives standing alone or accompanied by adjectives, numerals, participles, etc., do not always assume the prefix or suffix of their particular gender; there are special laws or rules presiding over this.

Masculines are all the nouns designating male persons, male relationships, male occupations; all animals, the higher and the lower, unless they are specially pointed out as of the female sex; all plants, trees, bushes, and weeds. Thus we have: óni *man*, kútuhuk *son*, íχtchaku *my grandfather*, kíwa *weasel*, híχku *mouse*, shími *pigeon*, ná-ara^{n} *snake*, níni *fish*, takírka *mollusk*, ríχku *tree*, ráyi *mulberry tree*, tápa *plant*.

Feminines are all the nouns designating female persons, occupations, and relationships, the celestial bodies, seasons and natural phenomena, the earth and its parts, the parts of the compass, the names of diseases and the abstract nouns. Examples: núχtchi *woman*, éχkutu wáliktch *my stepdaughter*, táχtchi *sun*, táχsaba *winter*, tíhikash *south*, íni yi *toothache*, káχshi *truth*.

About equally divided between both genders are the substantives which designate the parts and limbs of the human and animal body and of plants, and the objects of manufacture; it is difficult to decide which is the principle assigning these nouns to the one or the other category. Thus hässá^{n} *saw*, tchúhi *pillow*, wúχku *hat*, éruk *my neck*, úyu^{n} *bowels*, are masculines, while to the opposite gender belong nouns like: rí *house*, *lodge*, róhina *book*, *paper*, yúnka *rope*, ópushka *lung*, táχkishi *skin* and *bark* of plants.

I conclude this article with the remark that no language has ever been discovered upon the western continent which thus individualizes all the animate beings and inanimate objects as to sex, and does it with such a poetic, creative power, as Tunica.

The Association adjourned at 12.30 P. M.

The Secretary desires to state that all contributions of new words, of which a list was published in Vol. XIX. pp. 80–82, should be arranged upon the lines laid down by the sub-committee which edits the material furnished, viz.: all new words should be accompanied by the names of their authors so far as known, the place of their occurrence (page, etc.), the date of the issue of the book or journal in which they are contained, and the context of the sentence so far as is necessary to elucidate the meaning of the word. Communications may be addressed to the Secretary.

Digitized by Google

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1889–90.

PRESIDENT.

CHARLES R. LANMAN.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

JULIUS SACHS.
JOHN H. WRIGHT.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

TREASURER.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The officers above named, and —

MARTIN L. D'OOGE.
BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.
FRANCIS A. MARCH.
BERNADOTTE PERRIN.
WILLIAM D. WHITNEY.

Digitized by Google

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.[1]

1889–'90.

F. F. Abbott, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
J. W. Abernethy, Adelphi Academy, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Cyrus Adler, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Charles A. Aiken, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
Frederic D. Allen, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
George Gillespie Allen, Boston, Mass.
Joseph Anderson, Waterbury, Conn.
Louis F. Anderson, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington.
Robert Arrowsmith, Barnard School, St. Paul, Minn.
Sidney G. Ashmore, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
Charles W. Bain, Portsmouth, Va.
H. L. Baker, Detroit, Mich. (70 Griswold St.).
C. W. Ballard, 132 Franklin St., New York City.
Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
Timothy J. Barrett, Boston College, Boston, Mass.
William M. Baskerville, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Isbon T. Beckwith, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
A. J. Bell, Victoria College, Cobourg, Ont.
George Bendelari, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Charles E. Bennett, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (314 Mills St.).
T. S. Bettens, "The Kensington," cor. Fifty-seventh St. and Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.
Louis Bevier, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
P. M. Biklé, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
George H. Bingham, Pinkerton Academy, Derry, N. H.
E. C. Bissell, Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. (10 Garden St.).
Maurice Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
C. W. E. Body, Trinity College, Toronto, Ont.
Charles Frederic Bradley, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
H. C. G. Brandt, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
F. P. Brent, Onancock, Va.

[1] This list has been corrected up to Feb. 1, 1890; permanent addresses are given, as far as may be. Names where the residence is left blank are either of members who are in Europe, or of those whose addresses are not known to the Secretary.

Digitized by Google

Fisk P. Brewer, Grinnell, Ia.
Josiah Bridge, New York, N. Y. (69 West Forty-eighth St.).
Le Baron R. Briggs, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
John A. Broadus, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
Frank M. Bronson, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Jabez Brooks, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (1708 Laurel Ave.).
Walter H. Buell, Scranton, Pa. (243 Jefferson Ave.).
Sylvester Burnham, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Henry F. Burton, Univ. of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. (63 East Ave.).
Henry A. Buttz, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
Edward Capps, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
William H. Carpenter, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Franklin Carter, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Clarence F. Castle, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
Charles Chandler, Denison University, Granville, O.
Eva Channing, Forest Hill St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
A. C. Chapin, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
Elie Charlier (Life Member), 108 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
Frank A. Christie.
Bradbury L. Cilley, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
Kate Holladay Claghorn, Bryn Mawr College.
Edward B. Clapp, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.
Henry Clarke, 121 Elgin Crescent, Notting Hill, London W., England.
Henry A. Coit, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
W. C. Collar, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass.
Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
William T. Colville, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.
Richard S. Colwell, Denison University, Granville, O.
David Y. Comstock, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
Albert S. Cook, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
J. Randolph Coolidge, Jr., Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Oscar H. Cooper, Austin, Tex.
William L. Cowles, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Edward G. Coy, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
Howard Crosby, New York, N. Y. (116 East Nineteenth St.).
John M. Cross, Kingston, N. Y.
John M. Crow, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia.
W. S. Currell, Davidson College, N. C.
Samuel Ives Curtiss, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
William L. Cushing, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
Sanford L. Cutler, Hatfield Academy, Hatfield, Mass.
C. T. Davis, Packer Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Schele De Vere, University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.
Francis B. Denio, Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

Digitized by Google

Martin L. D'Ooge, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Manuel J. Drennan, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Morton W. Easton, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
T. T. Eaton, Louisville, Ky.
William Wells Eaton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Thomas H. Eckfeldt, Friends' School, New Bedford, Mass.
August Hjalmar Edgren, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Howard Edwards, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
James C. Egbert, Jr., Columbia College, New York.
Arthur M. Elliott, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Herbert C. Elmer, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Joseph Emerson, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
Carl W. Ernst, *The Beacon*, Boston, Mass.
Arthur Fairbanks.
H. R. Fairclough, University College, Toronto, Ont.
Charles E. Fay, Tufts College, College Hill, Mass.
Edwin W. Fay, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Thomas Fell, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.
E. G. Ferguson, McKendree College, Lebanon, Ill.
O. M. Fernald, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Mrs. G. W. Field, 204 Columbia Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Isaac Flagg, Westville, Conn.
John Fletcher, Queen's College, Kingston, Ont.
O. O. Fletcher, Springfield, Ill. (206 Capitol Avenue).
Carlton A. Foote, Latin School, Atkinson, Kans.
Harold N. Fowler, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
A. L. Fuller, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
William Gallagher, Williston Seminary, East Hampton, Mass.
Paul C. Gandolfo, St. Louis, Mo. (3102 Clark Ave.).
James M. Garnett, University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.
George P. Garrison, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.
Albert S. Gatschet, United States Bureau of Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.
Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
F. B. Goddard, Malden, Mass.
Julius Goebel, *Belletristisches Journal*, New York, N. Y. (P. O. Box 3595).
Thomas D. Goodell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Horace Goodhue, Jr., Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
Ralph L. Goodrich, U. S. Courts, Little Rock, Ark.
Abby M. Goodwin, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Richard J. H. Gottheil, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
James B. Greenough, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Lee L. Grumbine, Lebanon, Pa.

Digitized by Google

A. Gudeman, 40 East Sixty-ninth St., New York City.
William Gardner Hale, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Arthur P. Hall, Drury College, Springfield, Mo.
Isaac H. Hall, Metropolitan Museum, Central Park, New York, N. Y.
J. Leslie Hall, William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.
Randall C. Hall, General Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.
Charles S. Halsey, Union Classical Institute, Schenectady, N. Y.
William McD. Halsey, New York, N. Y. (34 West Fortieth St.).
B. F. Harding, Belmont School, Cambridge, Mass.
Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
William R. Harper, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
J. Rendel Harris, Haverford College, Pa.
Caskie Harrison, Latin School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (185 Montague St.).
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Paul Haupt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Edward Southworth Hawes, Cathedral School of St. Paul, Garden City, N. Y.
C. R. Hemphill, 817 Second St., Louisville, Ky.
Theophilus Heness, 142 Crown St., New Haven, Conn.
W. T. Hewett, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
John H. Hewitt, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Cambridge, Mass.
Hermann V. Hilprecht, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Horace A. Hoffman, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
Addison Hogue, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss.
Edward W. Hopkins, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
William Houston, Toronto, Can.
L. C. Hull, Lawrenceville, N. J.
E. R. Humphreys, Hotel Westland, Boston, Mass.
Milton W. Humphreys, University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.
W. I. Hunt, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
George B. Hussey, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
Edmund Morris Hyde, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa.
Andrew Ingraham, Swain Free School, New Bedford, Mass.
A. V. W. Jackson, Columbia College, New York, N. Y. (Highland Ave., Yonkers, N. Y.).
Hans C. G. von Jagemann, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Morris Jastrow, Jr., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Henry Johnson, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Henry C. Johnson, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
John Johnson, Dalhousie College, Halifax, N. S.
Thomas M. Johnson, Editor of *The Platonist*, Osceola, Mo.
R. V. Jones, Arcadia College, Wolfeville, N. S.
Thomas W. Jordan, Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va.
Robert P. Keep, Free Academy, Norwich, Conn.
Martin Kellogg, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Digitized by Google

Alexander Kerr, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
George Lyman Kittredge, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Charles S. Knox, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
William A. Lamberton, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Lewis H. Lapham, 68 Gold St., New York, N. Y.
C. W. Larned, U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.
William Cranston Lawton, Cambridge, Mass.
Abby Leach, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
M. D. Learned, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
J. T. Lees, Lincoln, Nebraska.
R. F. Leighton, Gloucester, Mass.
John M. Leonard, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
Thomas B. Lindsay, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
Gonzalez Lodge, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Charles Louis Loos, Kentucky University, Lexington, Ky.
Frances E. Lord, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
George D. Lord, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Jules Luquiens, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.
Frederick Lutz, Albion College, Albion, Mich.
Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Francis A. March, Jr., Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Samuel A. Martin, Lincoln University, Lincoln University P. O., Pa.
Winfred R. Martin.
Ellen F. Mason, Newport, R. I.
R. H. Mather, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
B. C. Matthews, Newark, N. J. (58 Lincoln Ave.).
W. Gordon McCabe, University School, Petersburg, Va.
J. J. McCook, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Joseph H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
George F. McKibben, Denison University, Granville, O.
Harriet E. McKinstry, Lake Erie Female Seminary, Painesville, O.
H. Z. McLain, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.
George McMillan, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Elmer T. Merrill, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
William A. Merrill, Miami University, Oxford, O.
Charles A. Moore, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Clifford H. Moore, Oakland, Cal.
Frank G. Moore, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
George F. Moore, Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
J. L. Moore, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Morris H. Morgan, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Digitized by Google

Edward P. Morris, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
John Robert Moses, Rugby Academy, Philadelphia, Pa. (3208 Race St.).
Wilfred H. Munro, 132 Benefit Street, Providence, R. I.
Augustus T. Murray, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.
Francis Philip Nash, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
C. K. Nelson, Brookeville Academy, Brookeville, Md.
James King Newton, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.
Frank W. Nicolson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Marston Niles, 155 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Edward North, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
Ransom Norton, Houlton, Me.
W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
William A. Packard, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
Arthur H. Palmer, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O. (750 Republic St.).
Charles P. Parker, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Henry E. Parker, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
E. G. Parsons, Derry, N. H.
James C. Parsons, Prospect Hill School, Greenfield, Mass.
Richard Parsons, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.
James M. Paton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Endicott Peabody, Groton School, Groton, Mass.
Calvin W. Pearson, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
Ernest M. Pease, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Henry T. Peck, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Tracy Peck, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (124 High St.).
Bernadotte Perrin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O. (837 Case Ave.).
Edward D. Perry, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Edward E. Phillips, Marietta College, Marietta, O.
W. H. P. Phyfe, 12 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.
Edwin M. Pickop, Hartford, Conn.
William T. Piper, Cambridge, Mass. (179 Brattle St.).
Samuel B. Platner, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
William Carey Poland, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (7 Cooke St.).
Louis Pollens, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Samuel Porter, National Deaf-Mute College, Washington, D. C.
William Porter, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
Edwin Post, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.
L. S. Potwin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O. (2108 Euclid Ave.).
John W. Powell, Washington, D. C.
Henry Preble, Rome, Italy (Baring Brothers).
George Prentice, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
Thomas R. Price, Columbia College, New York, N. Y. (212 Second Ave.).
Sylvester Primer, Friends' School, Providence, R. I.
Louis Dwight Ray, 2125 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.
John W. Redd, Centre College, Danville, Ky.

Digitized by Google

Horatio M. Reynolds, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
George M. Richardson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Rufus B. Richardson, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Arthur W. Roberts, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa.
Harley F. Roberts, Free Academy, Norwich, Conn.
David H. Robinson, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
William A. Robinson, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa.
F. E. Rockwood, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
George Rodemann, Cambridge, Mass.
Martin Luther Rouse, Douglasville, Ga.
Julius Sachs, Classical School, 38 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
Samuel G. Sanders, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex.
Thomas F. Sanford, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Wesley C. Sawyer, University of Pacific, College Park, Cal.
W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.
Henry Schliemann, Athens, Greece.
C. P. G. Scott, 76 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.
Henry A. Scribner, Plainfield, N. J.
Charles D. Seely, State Normal School, Brockport, N. Y.
William J. Seelye, Parsons College, Fairfield, Ia.
Jotham B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass.
Thomas D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (112 College St.).
Charles C. Shackford, Brookline, Mass. (4 Walnut Terrace).
Robert Sharp, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.
Joseph Alden Shaw, Highland Military Academy, Worcester, Mass.
Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
James P. Sheraton, Wycliffe College, Toronto, Ont.
William D. Shipman, Buchtel College, Akron, O.
Paul Shorey, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Henry A. Short, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Helen W. Shute, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
Carl Siedhof, Jr., 32 West Cedar St., Boston, Mass.
E. G. Sihler, Classical School, 38 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
M. S. Slaughter, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia.
Charles Foster Smith, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Clement Lawrence Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Frank Webster Smith, State Normal School, Westfield, Mass.
Josiah R. Smith, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
Richard M. Smith, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.
Albert H. Smyth, Philadelphia, Pa.
Herbert Weir Smyth, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Edward Snyder, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.
George C. S. Southworth, Salem, O.
Edward H. Spieker, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Jonathan Y. Stanton, Bates College, Lewiston, Me.

Digitized by Google

M. Wilson Sterling, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
J. R. S. Sterrett, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.
Edward F. Stewart, Easton, Pa.
Austin Stickney, 35 West Seventeenth St., New York, N. Y.
Morris H. Stratton, Salem, N. J.
J. J. Stürzinger, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
F. C. Sumichrast, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Charles W. Super, Ohio University, Athens, O.
Frank B. Tarbell, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Franklin Taylor, High School, Philadelphia, Pa. (629 North Twelfth St.).
John Phelps Taylor, Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
John Tetlow, Girls' High School, Boston, Mass.
J. Henry Thayer, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (67 Sparks St.).
William E. Thompson, Hamline University, Hamline, Minn.
Fitz Gerald Tisdall, College of the City of New York ("The Chelsea," 222 West Twenty-third St.), N. Y.
Edward M. Tomlinson, Alfred University, Alfred Centre, N. Y.
Henry A. Todd, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
H. C. Tolman, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
James A. Towle, Robbins School, Norfolk, Conn.
James R. Truax, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
Alfred C. True, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
James S. Trueman, Alleghany College, Alleghany, Pa.
J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.
Frank L. Van Cleef, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany.
Addison Van Name, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
J. W. H. Walden, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Hamilton Wallace, Public High School, Tulare, Cal.
Benjamin B. Warfield, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
Frederick M. Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Henry C. Warren, 67 Mount Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Minton Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
William E. Waters, Hughes High School, Cincinnati, O.
Benjamin W. Wells.
Andrew F. West, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
J. B. Weston, Christian Biblical Institute, Standfordville, N. Y.
L. K. Wharton, Liberty, Va.
A. S. Wheeler, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Conn.
Benjamin I. Wheeler, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
James R. Wheeler, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
Andrew C. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Horatio Stevens White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
John Williams White, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Henry Whitehorne, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
J. Ernest Whitney, Colorado Springs, Col.

Digitized by Google

William Dwight Whitney, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Mills Whittlesey, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Alexander M. Wilcox, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
Charles R. Williams, Associated Press, New York, N. Y.
S. Ross Winans, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
E. Lincoln Wood, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Henry Wood, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
W. G. Woodfin, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Frank E. Woodruff, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Charles Baker Wright, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Henry P. Wright, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (128 York St.).
John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (14 Avon St.).
Sarah E. Wright, Augusta Female Seminary, Staunton, Va.
A. C. Zenos, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

[Number of Members, 356.]

THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS (ALPHABETIZED BY TOWN) SUBSCRIBE FOR THE ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Akron, O.: Buchtel College Library.
Albany, N. Y.: N. Y. State Library (Care of Albany News Co., 508 Broadway, Albany).
Amherst, Mass.: Amherst College Library.
Andover, Mass.: Phillips Academy Library.
Andover, Mass.: Theological Seminary Library.
Ann Arbor, Mich.: Michigan University Library.
Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Library.
Baltimore, Md.: Peabody Institute.
Berea, Madison Co., Ky.: Berea College Library.
Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Library.
Boston, Mass.: Boston Athenæum.
Boston, Mass.: Boston Public Library.
Brooklyn, N. Y.: The Brooklyn Library.
Brunswick, Me.: Bowdoin College Library.
Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Bryn Mawr College Library.
Buffalo, N. Y.: The Buffalo Library.
Burlington, Vt.: Library of University of Vermont.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard College Library.
Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Library.
Chicago, Ill.: Public Library.
Cleveland, O.: Library of Adelbert College of Western Reserve University.
College Hill, Mass.: Tufts College Library.
Columbus, O.: Ohio State University Library.

Digitized by Google

Crawfordsville, Ind.: Wabash College Library.
Detroit, Mich.: Public Library.
Easton, Pa.: Lafayette College Library.
Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Library.
Gambier, O.: Kenyon College Library.
Geneva, N. Y.: Hobart College Library.
Greencastle, Ind.: De Pauw University Library.
Hanover, N. H.: Dartmouth College Library.
Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Library.
Lincoln, Neb.: Library of State University of Nebraska.
Marietta, O.: Marietta College Library.
Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Library.
Milwaukee, Wis.: Public Library.
Minneapolis, Minn.: Athenæum Library.
Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Library.
Newton Centre, Mass.: Library of Newton Theological Institution.
New York, N. Y.: Astor Library.
New York, N. Y.: Library of Columbia College.
New York, N. Y.: Library of The College of the City of New York (Lexington Ave. and Twenty-third St.).
New York, N. Y.: Union Theological Seminary Library (1200 Park Ave.).
Olivet, Eaton Co., Mich.: Olivet College Library.
Philadelphia, Pa.: American Philosophical Society.
Philadelphia, Pa.: The Library Company of Philadelphia.
Philadelphia, Pa.: The Mercantile Library.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.: Vassar College Library.
Providence, R. I.: Brown University Library.
Rochester, N. Y.: Rochester University Library.
Springfield, Mass.: City Library.
Tokio, Japan: Library of Imperial University.
University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.: University Library.
Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress.
Washington, D. C.: United States Bureau of Education.
Waterville, Me.: Colby University Library.
Wellesley, Mass.: Wellesley College Library.
Worcester, Mass.: Free Public Library.

[Number of subscribing institutions, 58.]

To the Following Libraries and Institutions have been sent complete sets (Volumes I.-XVIII.) of the Transactions, gratis.

American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece.
British Museum, London, England.
Royal Asiatic Society, London.

Digitized by Google

Philological Society, London.
Society of Biblical Archæology, London.
India Office Library, London.
Bodleian Library, Oxford.
Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, Scotland.
Trinity College Library, Dublin, Ireland.
Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Shanghai.
Japan Asiatic Society, Yokohama.
Public Library of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia.
Sir George Grey's Library, Cape Town, Africa.
Reykjavik College Library, Iceland.
University of Christiana, Norway.
University of Upsala, Sweden.
Russian Imperial Academy, St. Petersburg.
Austrian Imperial Academy, Vienna.
Anthropologische Gesellschaft, Vienna.
Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence, Italy.
Reale Accademia delle Scienze, Turin.
Société Asiatique, Paris, France.
Athénée Oriental, Louvain, Belgium.
Curatorium of the University, Leyden, Holland.
Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Batavia, Java.
Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, Berlin, Germany.
Royal Saxon Society of Sciences, Leipsic.
Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, Munich.
Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Halle.
Library of the University of Bonn.
Library of the University of Jena.
Library of the University of Königsberg.
Library of the University of Leipsic.
Library of the University of Tübingen.

Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

[Number of foreign Institutions, 36.]
[Total, (356 + 58 + 36 + 1 =) 451.]

Digitized by Google

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

ARTICLE I. — NAME AND OBJECT.

1. This Society shall be known as "The American Philological Association."

2. Its object shall be the advancement and diffusion of philological knowledge.

ARTICLE II. — OFFICERS.

1. The officers shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and Curator, and a Treasurer.

2. There shall be an Executive Committee of ten, composed of the above officers and five other members of the Association.

3. All the above officers shall be elected at the last session of each annual meeting.

ARTICLE III. — MEETINGS.

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association in the city of New York, or at such other place as at a preceding annual meeting shall be determined upon.

2. At the annual meeting, the Executive Committee shall present an annual report of the progress of the Association.

3. The general arrangements of the proceedings of the annual meeting shall be directed by the Executive Committee.

4. Special meetings may be held at the call of the Executive Committee, when and where they may decide.

Digitized by Google

Article IV. — Members.

1. Any lover of philological studies may become a member of the Association by a vote of the Executive Committee and the payment of five dollars as initiation fee, which initiation fee shall be considered the first regular annual fee.

2. There shall be an annual fee of three dollars from each member, failure in payment of which for two years shall *ipso facto* cause the membership to cease.

3. Any person may become a life member of the Association by the payment of fifty dollars to its treasury, and by vote of the Executive Committee.

Article V. — Sundries.

1. All papers intended to be read before the Association must be submitted to the Executive Committee before reading, and their decision regarding such papers shall be final.

2. Publications of the Association, of whatever kind, shall be made only under the authorization of the Executive Committee.

Article VI. — Amendments.

Amendments to this Constitution may be made by a vote of two-thirds of those present at any regular meeting subsequent to that in which they have been proposed.

Digitized by Google

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

THE annually published "Proceedings" of the American Philological Association contain an account of the doings at the annual meeting, brief abstracts of the papers read, reports upon the progress of the Association, and lists of its officers and members.

The annually published "Transactions" give the full text of such articles as the Executive Committee decides to publish. The Proceedings are bound with them as an Appendix.

The following tables show the authors and contents of the first eighteen volumes of Transactions: —

1869–1870. — Volume I.

Hadley, J.: On the nature and theory of the Greek accent.

Whitney, W. D.: On the nature and designation of the accent in Sanskrit.

Goodwin, W. W.: On the aorist subjunctive and future indicative with ὅπως and οὐ μή.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On the best method of studying the North American languages.

Haldeman, S. S.: On the German vernacular of Pennsylvania.

Whitney, W. D.: On the present condition of the question as to the origin of language.

Lounsbury, T. R.: On certain forms of the English verb which were used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On some mistaken notions of Algonkin grammar, and on mistranslations of words from Eliot's Bible, etc.

Van Name, A.: Contributions to Creole Grammar.

Proceedings of the preliminary meeting (New York, 1868), of the first annual session (Poughkeepsie, 1869), and of the second annual session (Rochester, 1870).

1871. — Volume II.

Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.

Allen, F. D.: On the so-called Attic second declension.

Whitney, W. D.: Strictures on the views of August Schleicher respecting the nature of language and kindred subjects.

Hadley, J.: On English vowel quantity in the thirteenth century and in the nineteenth.

March, F. A.: Anglo-Saxon and Early English pronunciation.

Bristed, C. A.: Some notes on Ellis's Early English Pronunciation.

Digitized by Google

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On Algonkin names for man.

Greenough, J. B.: On some forms of conditional sentences in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit.

Proceedings of the third annual session, New Haven, 1871.

1872. — Volume III.

Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: Words derived from Indian languages of North America.

Hadley, J.: On the Byzantine Greek pronunciation of the tenth century, as illustrated by a manuscript in the Bodleian Library.

Stevens, W. A.: On the substantive use of the Greek participle.

Bristed, C. A.: Erroneous and doubtful uses of the word *such*.

Hartt, C. F.: Notes on the Lingoa Geral, or Modern Tupí of the Amazonas.

Whitney, W. D.: On material and form in language.

March, F. A.: Is there an Anglo-Saxon language?

March, F. A.: On some irregular verbs in Anglo-Saxon.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: Notes on forty versions of the Lord's Prayer in Algonkin languages.

Proceedings of the fourth annual session, Providence, 1872.

1873. — Volume IV.

Allen, F. D.: The Epic forms of verbs in *άω*.

Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.

Hadley, J.: On Koch's treatment of the Celtic element in English.

Haldeman, S. S.: On the pronunciation of Latin, as presented in several recent grammars.

Packard, L. R.: On some points in the life of Thucydides.

Goodwin, W. W.: On the classification of conditional sentences in Greek syntax.

March, F. A.: Recent discussions of Grimm's law.

Lull, E. P.: Vocabulary of the language of the Indians of San Blas and Caledonia Bay, Darien.

Proceedings of the fifth annual session, Easton, 1873.

1874. — Volume V.

Tyler, W. S.: On the prepositions in the Homeric poems.

Harkness, A.: On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On an English vowel-mutation, present in *cag*, *keg*.

Packard, L. R.: On a passage in Homer's Odyssey (λ 81–86).

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On numerals in American Indian languages, and the Indian mode of counting.

Sewall, J. B.: On the distinction between the subjunctive and optatives modes in Greek conditional sentences.

Morris, C. D.: On the age of Xenophon at the time of the Anabasis.

Whitney, W. D.: *Φύσει* or *θέσει* — natural or conventional?

Proceedings of the sixth annual session, Hartford, 1874.

Digitized by Google

1875. — Volume VI.

Harkness, A.: On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On an English consonant-mutation, present in *proof*, *prove*.

Carter, F.: On Begemann's views as to the weak preterit of the Germanic verbs.

Morris, C. D.: On some forms of Greek conditional sentences.

Williams, A.: On verb-reduplication as a means of expressing completed action.

Sherman, L. A.: A grammatical analysis of the Old English poem "The Owl and the Nightingale."

Proceedings of the seventh annual session, Newport, 1875.

1876. — Volume VII.

Gildersleeve, B. L.: On *εἰ* with the future indicative and *ἐάν* with the subjunctive in the tragic poets.

Packard, L. R.: On Grote's theory of the structure of the Iliad.

Humphreys, M. W.: On negative commands in Greek.

Toy, C. H.: On Hebrew verb-etymology.

Whitney, W. D.: A botanico-philological problem.

Goodwin, W. W.: On *shall* and *should* in protasis, and their Greek equivalents.

Humphreys, M. W.: On certain influences of accent in Latin iambic trimeters.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On the Algonkin verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On a supposed mutation between *l* and *u*.

Proceedings of the eighth annual session, New York, 1876.

1877. — Volume VIII.

Packard, L. R.: Notes on certain passages in the Phaedo and the Gorgias of Plato.

Toy, C. H.: On the nominal basis on the Hebrew verb.

Allen, F. D.: On a certain apparently pleonastic use of *ὡς*.

Whitney, W. D.: On the relation of surd and sonant.

Holden, E. S.: On the vocabularies of children under two years of age.

Goodwin, W. W.: On the text and interpretation of certain passages in the Agamemnon of Aeschylus.

Stickney, A.: On the single case-form in Italian.

Carter, F.: On Willmann's theory of the authorship of the Nibelungenlied.

Sihler, E. G.: On Herodotus's and Aeschylus's accounts of the battle of Salamis.

Whitney, W. D.: On the principle of economy as a phonetic force.

Carter, F.: On the Kürenberg hypothesis.

March, F. A.: On dissimilated gemination.

Proceedings of the ninth annual session, Baltimore, 1877.

1878. — Volume IX.

Gildersleeve, B. L.: Contributions to the history of the articular infinitive.

Toy, C. H.: The Yoruban language.

Humphreys, M. W.: Influence of accent in Latin dactylic hexameters.

Sachs, J.: Observations on Plato's Cratylus.

Digitized by Google

Seymour, T. D.: On the composition of the Cynegeticus of Xenophon.
Humphreys, M. W.: Elision, especially in Greek.

Proceedings of the tenth annual session, Saratoga, 1878.

1879. — Volume X.

Toy, C. H.: Modal development of the Semitic verb.
Humphreys, M. W.: On the nature of caesura.
Humphreys, M. W.: On certain effects of elision.
Cook, A. S.: Studies in Heliand.
Harkness, A.: On the development of the Latin subjunctive in principal clauses.
D'Ooge, M. L.: The original recension of the De Corona.
Peck, T.: The authorship of the Dialogus de Oratoribus.
Seymour, T. D.: On the date of the Prometheus of Aeschylus.

Proceedings of the eleventh annual session, Newport, 1879.

1880. — Volume XI.

Humphreys, M. W.: A contribution to infantile linguistic.
Toy, C. H.: The Hebrew verb-termination *un*.
Packard, L. R.: The beginning of a written literature in Greece.
Hall, I. H.: The declension of the definite article in the Cypriote inscriptions.
Sachs, J.: Observations on Lucian.
Sihler, E. G.: Virgil and Plato.
Allen, W. F.: The battle of Mons Graupius.
Whitney, W. D.: On inconsistency in views of language.
Edgren, A. H.: The kindred Germanic words of German and English, exhibited with reference to their consonant relations.

Proceedings of the twelfth annual session, Philadelphia, 1880.

1881. — Volume XII.

Whitney, W. D.: On Mixture in Language.
Toy, C. H.: The home of the primitive Semitic race.
March, F. A.: Report of the committee on the reform of English spelling.
Wells, B. W.: History of the *a*-vowel, from Old Germanic to Modern English.
Seymour, T. D.: The use of the aorist participle in Greek.
Sihler, E. G.: The use of abstract verbal nouns in -σις in Thucydides.

Proceedings of the thirteenth annual session, Cleveland, 1881.

1882. — Volume XIII.

Hall, I. H.: The Greek New Testament as published in America.
Merriam, A. C.: Alien intrusion between article and noun in Greek.
Peck, T.: Notes on Latin quantity.
Owen, W. B.: Influence of the Latin syntax in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.
Wells, B. W.: The Ablaut in English.
Whitney, W. D.: General considerations on the Indo-European case-system.

Proceedings of the fourteenth annual session, Cambridge, 1882.

Digitized by Google

1883. — Volume XIV.

Merriam, A. C.: The Caesareum and the worship of Augustus at Alexandria.
Whitney, W. D.: The varieties of predication.
Smith, C. F.: On Southernisms.
Wells, B. W.: The development of the Ablaut in Germanic.
Proceedings of the fifteenth annual session, Middletown, 1883.

1884. — Volume XV.

Goodell, T. D.: On the use of the Genitive in Sophokles.
Tarbell, F. B.: Greek ideas as to the effect of burial on the future life of the soul.
Perrin, B.: The Crastinus episode at Palaepharsalus.
Peck, T.: Alliteration in Latin.
Von Jagemann, H. C. G.: Norman words in English.
Wells, B. W.: The Ablaut in High German.
Whitney, W. D.: Primary and Secondary Suffixes of Derivation and their ex changes.
Warren, M.: On Latin Glossaries. Codex Sangallensis, No. 912.
Proceedings of the sixteenth annual session, Hanover, 1884.

1885. — Volume XVI.

Easton, M. W.: The genealogy of words.
Goodell, T. D.: Quantity in English verse.
Goodwin, W. W.: Value of the Attic talent in modern money.
Goodwin, W. W.: Relation of the Πρόεδροι to the Πρυτάνεις in the Attic Βουλή.
Perrin, B.: Equestrianism in the Doloneia.
Richardson, R. B.: The appeal to sight in Greek tragedy.
Seymour, T. D.: The feminine caesura in Homer.
Sihler, E. G.: A study of Dinarchus.
Wells, B. W.: The vowels *e* and *i* in English.
Whitney, W. D.: The roots of the Sanskrit language.
Proceedings of the seventeenth annual session, New Haven, 1885.

1886. — Volume XVII.

Tarbell, F. B.: Phonetic law.
Sachs, J.: Notes on Homeric Zoölogy.
Fowler, H. N.: The sources of Seneca de Beneficiis.
Smith, C. F.: On Southernisms.
Wells, B. W.: The sounds *o* and *u* in English.
Fairbanks, A.: The Dative case in Sophokles.
The Philological Society, of England, and The American Philological Association: Joint List of Amended Spellings.
Proceedings of the eighteenth annual session, Ithaca, 1886.

Digitized by Google

1887. — Volume XVIII.

Allen, W. F.: The monetary crisis in Rome, A.D. 33.
Sihler, E. G.: The tradition of Cæsar's Gallic Wars, from Cicero to Orosius.
Clapp, E. B.: Conditional sentences in Aischylos.
Pease, E. M.: On the relative value of the manuscripts of Terence.
Smyth, H. W.: The Arcado-Cyprian dialect.
Wells, B. W.: The sounds *o* and *u* in English.
Smyth, H. W.: The Arcado-Cyprian dialect. — *Addenda.*
Proceedings of the nineteenth annual session, Burlington, 1887.

1888. — Volume XIX.

Allen, W. F.: The *Lex Curiata de Imperio.*
Goebel, J.: On the impersonal verbs.
Bridge, J.: On the authorship of the Cynicus of Lucian.
Whitney, J. E.: The "Continued Allegory" in the first book of the Fairy Queene.
March, F. A.: Standard English: its pronunciation, how learned.
Brewer, F. P.: Register of new words.
Proceedings of the twentieth annual session, Amherst, 1888.

1889. — Volume XX.

Smyth, H. W.: The vowel system of the Ionic dialect.
Gudeman, A.: A new source in Plutarch's Life of Cicero.
Gatschet, A. S.: Sex-denoting nouns in American languages.
Cook, A. S.: Metrical observations on a Northumbrianized version of the Old English Judith.
Cook, A. S.: Stressed vowels in Ælfric's Homilies.
Proceedings of the twenty-first annual session, Easton, 1889.
Index of authors, and index of subjects, Vols. I.–XX.

The Proceedings of the American Philological Association are distributed gratis upon application until they are out of print.

Separate copies of articles printed in the Transactions are given to the authors for distribution.

The "Transactions *for*" any given year are not always published in that year. To avoid mistakes in ordering back volumes, please state — not the year of publication, but rather — the year *for* which the Transactions are desired, adding also the volume-number, according to the following table: —

Digitized by Google

The Transactions	for	1869	*and* 1870	form	Volume	I.
"	"	"	1871	form	Volume	II.
"	"	"	1872	"	"	III.
"	"	"	1873	"	"	IV.
"	"	"	1874	"	"	V.
"	"	"	1875	"	"	VI.
"	"	"	1876	"	"	VII.
The Transactions	for	1877	form	Volume		VIII.
"	"	"	1878	"	"	IX.
"	"	"	1879	"	"	X.
"	"	"	1880	"	"	XI.
"	"	"	1881	"	"	XII.
"	"	"	1882	"	"	XIII.
"	"	"	1883	"	"	XIV.
"	"	"	1884	"	"	XV.
"	"	"	1885	"	"	XVI.
"	"	"	1886	"	"	XVII.
"	"	"	1887	"	"	XVIII.
"	"	"	1888	"	"	XIX.
"	"	"	1889	"	"	XX.

The price of these volumes is $2.00 apiece, except Volumes XV. and XX., for which $2.50 are charged. The first two volumes will not be sold separately.

REDUCTION IN THE PRICE OF COMPLETE SETS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES.

Single COMPLETE SETS of the Transactions (Volumes I.–XX.) will be sold to public libraries, until further notice, at *thirty-five* dollars a set.

It is especially appropriate that *American* Libraries should exert themselves to procure this series while it may be had. It is the work of *American* scholars, and contains many valuable articles not elsewhere accessible; and, aside from these facts, as the first collection of essays in general philology made in this country, it is sure to be permanently valuable for the history of American scholarship.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

INDEX I.

INDEX OF CONTRIBUTORS.

Vols. I–XX.

In the following index are found the titles of all papers presented before the Association, not excluding the few of which no abstract was published. Roman numerals denote volumes of the *Transactions*, heavy-faced Arabic numerals denote volumes of the *Proceedings;* others refer to pages. A heavy-faced Arabic numeral in parenthesis refers to a paper published in the *Transactions*, whose abstract is to be found in the *Proceedings* at the place stated. 1 A represents *Proc.* for 1869, 1 B, *Proc.* for 1870, published together with Vol. I; P. A., *President's Address.*

ADLER, CYRUS.

Hebrew words in Latin glossary Codex Sangallensis 912; **17** 4.

Remarks on the Shapira Hebrew roll, deposited in the Rush Library at Philadelphia; **15** 41.

Semitic languages in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (9th ed.); **18** 14.

Some peculiarities of a Hebrew MS. of the fourteenth century of the Christian era; **15** 33.

ALLEN, F. D.

On a certain apparently pleonastic use of ὡς; VIII 38 (**8** 12).

On the so-called Attic second declension; II 18 (**2** 12).

On the term *contamination* used in reference to the Latin comedy; **19** 25.

The epic forms of verbs in αω; IV 5 (**4** 16).

The University of Leyden in its relation to classical studies (P. A.); **13** 18.

ALLEN, W. F.

The battle of Mons Graupius; XI 83 (**11** 26).

The *lex curiata de imperio;* XIX 5 (**19** 31).

The locality of the *Saltus Teutoburgiensis;* **19** 35.

The monetary crisis in Rome, A.D. 33; XVIII 5 (**18** 20).

Two passages in the *Germania* of Tacitus; **4** 4.

ANDERSON, JOSEPH.

The newly discovered relationship of the Tuteloes to the Dakotan stock; **2** 15.

ANDREWS, S. P.

Ideological etymology as a distinct method in philology; **10** 4.

ARNOLD, A. N.

Pronunciation of classical Greek; **1** A 12.

AVERY, JOHN.

The Tibeto-Burman group of languages; **16** 17.

Digitized by Google

BAKER, H. L.
Roman elements in English law; **20** 22.
BITTINGER, J. B.
What Shakespeare knew of horsemanship — a new reading of *Macbeth;* I 7; **7** 39.
BLACKWELL, J. S.
Ashtôreth, the Canaanitish goddess; **17** 8.
Comparison of a few versions in regard to the precious stones of the Jewish high-priest's breastplate; **12** 11.
Shemitic or Semitic? **12** 27.
The testimony of the *Talmud* respecting the ancient pronunciation of certain Latin letters; **12** 5.
BLISS, P. C.
Remarks on the languages of South America; **1** A 29.
BRANDT, H. C. G.
The Roman alphabet in German; **9** 8.
BREWER, F. P.
A new word: *arbútus;* **19** 27.
Demosthenes' *De Corona*, § 262; **7** 41.
Inaccuracies in Grote's narrative of the retreat of the Ten Thousand; **2** 4.
On a MS. of Mediæval Latin; **5** 5.
On the origin of *ν* movable in Greek; **12** 22.
Recent excavations in Athens; **4** 25.
Register of new words; XIX 79.
The acquisition of a double mother-tongue; **4** 21.
The English suffix *ist;* **6** 28.
The modern Greek language in Cyprus; **8** 9.
The word *election* in American politics; **17** 7.
BRIDGE, JOSIAH.
On the authorship of the *Cynicus* of Lucian; XIX 33 (**19** 29).
BRIGHAM, C. H.
A Siamese MS.; **5** 28.
Cornill's examination of the Aethiopic book of the *Wise Philosopher;* **7** 19.
On an Ethiopic MS.; **5** 3.
The Agaou language; **5** 33.
The great Harris papyrus; **4** 10.
BRISTED, C. A.
Erroneous and doubtful usages of the word *such;* III 55 (**3** 5).
Some exaggerations in comparative philology; **3** 22.
Some notes on Ellis' Early English pronunciation; II 114 (**2** 11).
The best method of pronouncing the Latin and Greek languages; **1** A 12.
CARR, W. B.
Virgil's views of the collective noun; **8** 24.
CARTER, FRANKLIN.
On Begemann's views as to the weak preterite of the Germanic verbs; VI 22 (**6** 23).
On the Kürenberg hypothesis; VIII 134.

Digitized by Google

On Wilmanns' theory of the authorship of the *Nibelungenlied;* VIII 94 (**8** 11).

CATTELL, W. C.

The etymologies of Lactantius; **11** 17.

Papyrus scroll at Lafayette College; **4** 10.

CLAPP, E. B.

Conditional sentences in Aeschylus; XVIII 43 (**18** 11).

COLTON, H. M.

The best method of instruction in the classical languages; **1** A 15.

COMFORT, G. F.

Helveticisms in Schiller's *Tell;* **5** 32.

Illustrations in etymology; **3** 18.

The importance of post-graduate instruction in language; **1** A 24.

The order of precedence in study of the ancient and the modern languages; **2** 9.

The specific use of some English words; **4** 26.

COOK, A. S.

Metrical observations on a Northumbrianized version of the Old English *Judith;* XX 172.

Stressed vowels in Ælfric's *Homilies;* XX 175.

Studies in the *Heliand;* X 60 (**10** 28).

CROSBY, HOWARD.

On language (P. A.); **2** 8.

DE VERE, SCHELE.

The critical study of the English language; **1** A 19.

D'OOGE, M. L.

The documents in Demosthenes' *On the Crown;* **5** 12.

The guilt or innocence of the *Antigone* of Sophocles; **14** 18.

The historical method and purpose in philology (P. A.); **15** 11.

The original recension of the *De Corona;* X 92 (**10** 24).

The reading and interpretation of verse 572 of the *Antigone* of Sophocles; **12** 29.

DOUAI, ADOLF.

A concise system of grammatical terms, according to the teachings of comparative philology; **4** 11.

DWIGHT, B. W.

Considerations in favor of the thorough reconstruction of Latin grammar on philological and analytical principles; **1** B 22.

The desirableness of thorough classical study to the attainment of the ends of the higher education; **1** A 17.

The importance of etymology in linguistic education; **3** 23.

EASTON, M. W.

Aphasia, and its contributions to the science of language; **4** 11.

The genealogy of words; XVI 54 (**16** 21).

EDGREN, H. A.

The kindred Germanic words of German and English, exhibited with reference to their consonant relations; XI 113 (**11** 8).

Digitized by Google

ELLIS, ROBERT.
Observations on Dr. Trumbull's *Numerals in North American Languages;* **7** 8.
EMERSON, ALFRED.
Aristophanes and low comedy; **17** 38.
ERNST, C. W.
The pronunciation of German vowels; **5** 19.
The structure of the German sentence; **6** 16.
ENTLER, G. R.
A comparative view of the language of *Deuteronomy* and *Jeremiah;* **6** 9.
The origin of the Hebrew article הַ; **7** 4.
EVANS, E. W.
Studies in Cymric etymology; II 1 (**2** 22), III 5 (**3** 13), IV 20.
FAIRBANKS, ARTHUR.
The dative case in Sophocles; XVII 78 (**17** 25).
FEULING, J. B.
The rime in Latin and Greek poetry; **8** 9.
The best method of pronouncing the Latin and Greek languages; **1** A 11.
FISCHER, GUSTAV.
The present condition of Latin grammar; **5** 23.
FISHER, M. M.
On Latin pronunciation; **12** 21.
FORD, ALFRED.
The elements of metrical art, with special reference to the construction of the English heroic verse; **3** 14.
FOWLER, H. N.
The sources of Seneca *De Beneficiis;* XVII 24 (**17** 9).
FOWLER, W. W.
Paradoxes in language; **5** 4.
The derivation of English monosyllabic personal surnames; **3** 10.
GARRISON, G. P.
Differentiation in the uses of *shall* and *will;* **20** 20.
GATSCHET, A. S.
On syllabic reduplication as observed in Indian languages, and in the Klamath language of S. W. Oregon in particular; **10** 35.
On the affinity of the Cheroki to the Iroquois dialects; **16** 40.
On the substantive verb in some North American languages; **15** 26.
Sex-denoting nouns in American languages; XX 159 (**20** 45).
GIBBS, GEORGE.
The mode of expressing number in certain Indian languages; **2** 25.
What more efficient measures can be taken to preserve from destruction the aboriginal languages? **1** A 27.
GILDERSLEEVE, B. L.
Contributions to the history of the articular infinitive; IX 5 (**9** 24).
On εἰ with the future indicative and ἐάν with the subjunctive in the tragic poets; VII 5 (**7** 17).
On the encroachments of μή upon οὐ in later Greek; **10** 31.

Digitized by Google

On the use of πρίν in the Attic orators; **12** 23.
The special province of the American philologian (P. A.); **9** 21.
GOEBEL, JULIUS.
On the impersonal verbs; XIX 20 (**19** 29).
GOODELL, T. D.
Quantity in English verse; XVI 78 (**16** 6).
Remarks on theories of English verse; **19** 21.
The genitive case in Sophocles; XV 5 (**15** 14).
GOODWIN, W. A.
Chaucer's *Cecilia;* **10** 15.
The word *juise* — its pronunciation in Worcester's and Webster's Dictionaries; **6** 26.
GOODWIN, W. W.
Greek expressions of future-perfect time; **8** 22.
On Greek verbs which add *epsilon* to the stem in certain tenses not belonging to the present system; **10** 34.
On *shall* and *should* in protasis, and their Greek equivalents; VII 87 (**7** 15) and **8** 23.
On the aorist subjunctive and future indicative with ὅπως and οὐ μή; I 46 (**1** B 9).
On the classification of conditional sentences in Greek syntax; IV 60 (**4** 14).
On the text and interpretation of certain passages in the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus; VIII 69 (**8** 12).
On verses 453–455 of the *Antigone;* **7** 4.
The American School of Classical Studies at Athens (P. A.); **16** 11.
The chronology of some of the events mentioned in Demosthenes' *On the Crown;* **2** 24.
The "Hero Physician" and the "Hero καλαμίτης" mentioned by Demosthenes; **4** 25.
The relation of the Greek optative to the subjunctive and the other moods; **20** 36.
The relation of the πρόεδροι to the πρυτάνεις in the Athenian senate; XVI 165 (**16** 35).
The value of the Attic talent in modern money; XVI 116 (**16** 22).
GRAVES, R. H.
The Chinese language; **3** 11.
GREENOUGH, J. B.
On some forms of conditional sentences in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit; II 159 (**2** 28).
Some Latin etymologies; **18** 14.
The uses of the Latin *cum;* **3** 22.
GRUMBINE, L. L.
Provincialisms of the "Dutch" districts of Pennsylvania; **17** 12.
GUDEMAN, A.
A new source of Plutarch's Life of Cicero; XX 139 (**20** 36).
Maximus Planudes: his life and works; **20** 6.

Digitized by Google

HADLEY, JAMES.
On English vowel quantity in t
teenth; II 65 (**2** 10).
On Koch's treatment of the Ce
On the Byzantine Greek pronu
by a MS. in the Bodleian li
On the nature and theory of
HALDEMAN, S. S.
English words formed by p
Note on the invention of v
On a supposed mutation l
On an English consonant
On an English vowel-m
On spurious words; **1**0
On the German verna
On the pronunciation
IV 44 (**4** 20).
On Virgil's hexame
Reform of English
Some points of E
The best metho
A 11.
HALE, W. G.
The *cum* const
The sequence
HALL, F. E.
Imperfect te
HALL, HORATIO.
The Huron
HALL, I. H.
An unpub
Contribut
On Ame
Remarks
Some S
T

Digitized by Google

The progress and results of philological studies during the century (P. A.); **7** 11.

HARRISON, J. A.

Negro-English, **16** 31.

HARTT, CH. FRED.

Notes on the Lingoa Geral or modern Tupí of the Amazonas; III 58.

HEWETT, W. T.

Remarks on the personal element in dactylic hexameters; **14** 29.

HIGGINSON, T. W.

An old Latin text-book; **2** 19.

Philanthropy; **5** 20.

HOLDEN, E. S.

On the vocabularies of children under two years of age; VIII 58 (**8** 23).

The number of words used in speaking and writing English; **6** 4.

HOPKINS, E. W.

The quality of Sanskrit *a-kāra;* **20** 40.

HUMPHREYS, M. W.

A contribution to infantile linguistic; XI 5 (**11** 18).

Conservatism in textual criticism (P. A.); **14** 7.

Elision, especially in Greek; IX 84 (**9** 26).

Influence of accent in Latin dactylic hexameters; IX 39 (**9** 14).

On certain effects of elision; X 32 (**10** 16).

On certain influences of accent in Latin iambic trimeters; VII 107 (**7** 45).

On negative commands in Greek; VII 46 (**7** 19).

On the nature of caesura; X 25 (**10** 11).

The eleventh chapter of the first book of Thucydides; **13** 27.

HUNT, T. W.

Open questions in English philology; **20** 19.

HURLBURT, T.

On the structure of the Indian languages; **1** A 26.

HUSSEY, G. B.

On the use of verbs of *saying* in the Platonic dialogues; **20** 37.

HYDE, A. B.

The disuse of passive forms in languages of the Aryan family, and their replacement by reflexive forms; **1** B 12.

JAGEMANN, H. C. G. VON.

On the relation of the Anglo-Norman vowel system to the Norman words in English; XV 66 (**15** 21).

JASTROW, MORRIS, Jr.

Assyrian, in its relation to Hebrew and Arabic; **17** 18.

Delitzsch's Assyrian Dictionary; **18** 12.

KEEP, R. P.

Mr. Isaac Taylor's "Etruscan Researches"; **5** 29.

On the monasteries of Mount Athos; **15** 23.

KENDRICK, A. C.

Language in its scientific, its aesthetic, and its historical relations (P. A); **4** 8.

Digitized by Google

Pronunciation of the Greek aspirates; **2** 27.
Relations of language to national culture and development (P. A.); **3** 7.
Translation into English of the Greek aorist participle; **1** B 17.
KERRUISH, W. S.
On the language of the Isle of Man; **12** 14.
KNAPP, W. I.
Munda; **17** 37.
LANMAN, C. R.
On a group of Sanskrit derivatives (çaraṇá, çárman, çárira, etc.); **15** 7.
LEIGHTON, R. F.
An account of a new MS. of Cicero's letters *ad familiares;* **10** 12.
The wages of schoolmasters in ancient Rome; **13** 50.
LISCOMB, W. S.
Forms of assibilation; **8** 28.
LOUNSBURY, T. R.
On certain forms of the English verb, which were used in the 16th and 17th centuries; I 95 (**1** B 10).
LULL, E. P.
Vocabulary of the language of the Indians of San Blas and Caledonia Bay, Isthmus of Darien; IV 103 (**4** 7).
MAGILL, E. H.
The true foundation for a course of linguistic studies; **1** A 15.
MARCH, F. A.
A confession about *Othello;* **12** 31.
Anglo-Saxon and Early English pronunciation; II 108 (**2** 12).
Dissimilated gemination; **6** 21.
Is there an Anglo-Saxon language? III 97 (**3** 20).
List of amended spellings; XVII 127.
President's Address 1874; **5** 6.
On consonant notation and vowel definition; **17** 30.
On dissimilated gemination; VIII 145.
On once-used words in Shakespeare; **17** 30.
On some irregular verbs in Anglo-Saxon; III 110 (**3** 21).
On surds and sonants; **13** 33.
Recent discussions of Grimm's law; IV 80 (**4** 22).
Remarks on Hamlet's "*dram of eale,*" and what it "*doth*"; **14** 24.
Remarks on No. CCCXXVIII of the codex diplomaticus Anglo-Saxonum; **7** 42.
Remarks on the method of phonetic change in language; **17** 36.
Remarks upon quantity in English verse; **16** 8.
Some points in Anglo-Saxon phonology; **11** 6.
Standard English; **18** 10.
Standard English: its pronunciation, how learned; XIX 70 (**19** 16).
The Dictionary of the English Philological Society; **10** 23, **11** 26.
The harmonies of verse; **14** 11.
The immaturity of Shakespeare as shown in *Hamlet;* **6** 28.

Digitized by Google

The influence of written English and of the linguistic authorities upon spoken English; **15** 35.
The locutions *two first* and *first two;* **13** 30.
The meter of Milton's *Paradise Lost;* **20** 13.
The neo-grammarians ("Junggrammatiker"); **16** 19.
The new spellings of the Philological Society in London; XII 52 (**12** 25).
The origin of language; **2** 18.
The personal element in dactylic hexameters; **14** 26.
The point of view in *King Lear;* **11** 6.
The study of comparative grammar in college; **4** 18.
The study of English in preparation for college; **20** 36.
The world of Beowulf; **13** 21.
Volapük, and the law of least effort; **19** 18.
What acts are to be attributed to the "faculty of speech," and how far are they instinctive? **7** 43.

MARTIN, D. S.
The relation of philological accuracy to scientific nomenclature; **7** 32.

MATTHEWS, WASHINGTON.
Remarks on the best way of studying the aboriginal languages of North America; **2** 26.

McCARTEE, H.
Languages and dialects of China; **1** B 15.

McCOSH, JAMES.
Relation of language to education; **1** A 29.

MERRIAM, A. C.
Alien intrusion between article and noun in Greek; XIII 34 (**13** 25).
Ancient tunnels; **16** 51.
An experiment in reading Greek at sight with volunteer classes in college; **11** 30.
On some passages in the *Odyssey;* **10** 8.
President's Address; **18** 7.
The Caesareum and the worship of Augustus at Alexandria; XIV 5 (**14** 9).
The Homeric φίλος; **9** 15.
Temporal coincidence of the aorist participle with the primary verb; **8** 4.
The law code of the Cretan Gortyna; **16** 34.
Troy and Cyprus; **6** 19.

MERRILL, W. A.
Some peculiarities of diction and syntax in Cicero's *De legibus;* **18** 31.
The changes in the Roman constitution proposed by Cicero (Legg. III 3, 6–5, 12); **19** 8.

MIXER, A. H.
The Celtic elements in French; **2** 21.
The true position of the modern languages in our college curriculum; **1** A 23.

MORGAN, L. H.
Australian kinship; **3** 15.

Digitized by Google

MORGAN, M. H.
A consideration of the method employed in lighting the vestal fire; **19** 22.
MORRIS, C. D.
On οὐ μή with the future in prohibitions; **13** 35.
On some forms of Greek conditional sentences; VI 44 (**6** 27).
On the age of Xenophon at the time of the *Anabasis;* V 82 (**5** 25).
MORSE, C. F.
An ancient Bulgarian poem concerning Orpheus; **2** 27.
MUNSON, J. E.
The relation of phonetics to philology, **1** A 22.
NELSON, C. K.
Dr. J. A. H. Murray's new English Dictionary; **18** 5.
Edward Wallace's translation of Aristotle's *Psychology;* **14** 18.
On the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles;* **15** 36.
Semitic studies, especially as illustrated in Hebrew, and their relation to modern philology; **8** 14.
The authorship of the *Epistle to the Hebrews;* **17** 31, **18** 9 (second paper).
The force of Δίκη in the Greek theosophy; **14** 9.
The Gothic Bible of Ulfilas; **16** 37.
The philosophy of Lucretius; **16** 51.
NICHOLSON, F. W.
On the interpretation of Aristophanes' *Achar.* 849; **20** 20.
O'KEEFE, C. M.
The proper names in the first sentence of Cæsar's *Commentaries;* **6** 13.
OWEN, W. B.
Influence of the Latin syntax in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels; XIII 59 (**13** 29).
Notes on the Anglo-Saxon translation of St. Luke's Gospel; **15** 26.
PACKARD, L. R.
Notes on certain passages in the *Phaedo* and the *Gorgias* of Plato; VIII 5 (**8** 21).
On a passage in Homer's *Odyssey* (κ 81–86); V 31 (**5** 11).
On Geddes' *Problem of the Homeric poems;* **10** 27.
On Grote's theory of the structure of the *Iliad;* VII 24 (**7** 18).
On some points in the life of Thucydides; IV 47 (**4** 4).
The beginning of a written literature in Greece; XI 34 (**11** 25).
The morality and religion of the Greeks (P. A.); **12** 7.
PARSONS, J. C.
Theories of English verse; **19** 18.
PEASE, E. M.
The relative value of the MSS. of Terence; XVIII 30 (**18** 17).
PECK, TRACY.
Alliteration in Latin; XV 58 (**15** 22).
Certain differences among the ancient Romans in the pronunciation of their language; **7** 26.
Notes as to Latin quantity; XIII 50 (**13** 28).
The authorship of the *Dialogus de Oratoribus;* X 105 (**10** 33).

Digitized by Google

PERRIN, B.
Equestrianism in the *Doloneia;* XVI 104 (**16** 9).
The Crastinus episode at Palaepharsalus; XV 46 (**15** 6).
PIERSON, J.
The critical study of the English language in our academies and high schools; **1** A 19.
PLATNER, S. B.
A comparison of the three recensions of the *Rāmāyaṇa;* **16** 47.
PORTER, SAMUEL.
A word about the sonant fricative consonants; **15** 40.
On positions of the larynx in vowel articulations, with remarks concerning Bell's "Visible Speech"; **16** 45.
On the vowel-scheme of Melville Bell; **12** 18.
The mute consonants, sonant and surd; **14** 14.
The terms *substantive verb* and *verb of existence*, and the nature of the distinction of subject and predicate; **7** 21.
POTWIN, L. S.
Horace *vs.* his scholiast (*De Arte Poet.* 175, 176); **17** 37.
On the identity of words and the misapplication of the term *cognate* to words that are *identical;* **19** 32.
The survival of gender in *this* and *that;* **17** 29.
POWELL, J. W.
Notes and vocabularies of Indian dialects; **8** 32.
PRICE, T. R.
Remarks on theories of English verse; **19** 22.
The dramatic features of *Winter's Tale;* **20** 21.
PRIMER, SYLVESTER.
The pronunciation near Fredericksburg, Va.; **20** 25.
RICHARDSON, G. M.
Goethe's Homeric Studies; **19** 16.
RICHARDSON, R. B.
Aeschines' reticence; **18** 9.
The appeal to the sense of sight in Greek tragedy; XVI 41 (**16** 22).
RICHARDSON, W. G.
Statistics as to Latin pronunciation in American colleges and universities; **6** 11.
RIGGS, S. R.
Concerning Dakota beliefs; **2** 5.
ROUSE, M. L.
Music in speech; **18** 34.
SACHS, JULIUS.
Notes on Homeric zoölogy; XVII 17 (**17** 14).
Observations on Lucian; XI 66 (**11** 9).
Observations on Plato's *Cratylus;* IX 59 (**9** 13).
On a Greek inscription from Larisa; **14** 17.
SAMSON, G. W.
Embryological method in the study of language; **1** B 19.

Digitized by Google

Reciprocal influence of languages developed amid ancient Mediterranean civilization; **3** 15.
Sign-language, as indicating the law of vocal and written language; **2** 19.

SANDER, ANTON.
On Greek negatives; **10** 18.

SAVAGE, A. D.
'Ραδαμάνδυος ὅρκος, or did the notion of irreverence in swearing exist among the Greeks? **9** 27.

SAWYER, W. C.
Some contributions of the phonograph to phonetic science; **9** 11.
The alphabet, as a means to an end; **7** 36.

SCARBOROUGH, W. S.
Ancipiti in Cæsar, *B. G.*, I 26; **18** 38.
Fatalism in Homer and Virgil; **16** 36.
Grote on Thuc. VI 17 (ἀνέλπιστοι); **18** 5.
Notes on Andocides; **20** 5.
Observations on the fourth eclogue of Virgil; **19** 36.
The *Birds* of Aristophanes; **17** 7.
The theory and function of the thematic vowel in the Greek verb; **15** 6.

SCHNYDER, A.
Observations on vowel-utterance; **15** 38.

SCOTT, C. P. G.
An unstable idiom in English; **20** 25.
Hamlet's "*dram of eale*," and what it "*doth*"; **14** 22.
On initial P in Gothic and Anglo-Saxon; **13** 44.
On the use of the Anglo-Saxon particles in the laws of Alfred; **11** 24.
The enchantment of *grammar*; **20** 45.
The etymology of *akimbo*, *brick*, *hodden*; **18** 34.

SEWALL, J. B.
On the distinction between the subjunctive and optative modes in Greek conditional sentences; V 77 (**5** 10).
Our duty to our mother-tongue (P. A.); **10** 6.
The Greek indicative, subjunctive, and optative moods: what is the distinction between them? **9** 19.
The written alphabet of our colonial fathers; **13** 5.

SEYMOUR, T. D.
Emendation to Euripides' *Cyclops*, v. 507; **13** 40.
On hanging among the Greeks; **15** 16.
On the composition of the *Cynegeticus* of Xenophon; IX 69 (**9** 28).
On the date of the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus; X 111 (**10** 19).
On the feminine caesura in Homer; XVI 30 (**16** 38).
On the smile of Aphrodite, Theocr. I 95–96; **13** 41.
On the so-called *tmesis*; **14** 25.
On the use of the aorist participle in Greek; XII 88 (**12** 24).
Philological study in America (P. A.); **20** 10.
The tripods of Hephaestus; **19** 25.

Digitized by Google

SHEARER, J. W.
Phonetic reform; **7** 36.
SHELDON, E. S.
The New England pronunciation of *o*; **14** 19.
SHERMAN, L. A.
A grammatical analysis of the Old English poem *The Owl and the Nightingale*; VI 69 (**6** 30).
The Greek article as a pronoun; **9** 18.
SHORT, CHARLES.
The history of the Latin Vulgate and the characteristics of its Latinity; **5** 13.
SHUTE, S. M.
The more extensive study of the English language and literature in our regular college courses; **4** 17.
SIHLER, E. G.
A study of Dinarchus; XVI 120 (**16** 34).
Critical miscellany [Eur. Suppl. 1049; Herod. VIII 124; Dinarch. c. Dem. 28 and c. Aristog. 15; Thuc. I. 50, 1, and II 37, 1; Plutarch Vit. Lycurg. 13, 5; Xen. Anab. several passages]; **16** 40.
Diogenes Laertius and Lucian, or notes on the tradition of Oriental descent of Greek philosophy; **11** 5.
On Herodotus's and Aeschylus's accounts of the battle of Salamis; VIII 109 (**8** 6).
On Homer and Strabo; **12** 4.
On the verbal abstract nouns in *-σις* in Thucydides; XII 96 (**12** 16).
The critical and rhetorical labors of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the *Ars Rhetorica*; **10** 3.
The historical aspect of Old Attic comedy; **7** 15.
The tradition of Cæsar's Gallic Wars from Cicero to Orosius; XVIII 19 (**18** 6).
Virgil and Plato; XI 72 (**11** 33).
SMITH, C. F.
On Southernisms; XIV 42 (**14** 5), XVII 34 (**17** 23).
SMYTH, H. W.
The Arcado-Cyprian dialect; XVIII 59 (**18** 27).
The interrelations of the dialects of northern Greece; **17** 14.
The vowel system of the Ionic dialect; XX 5 (**20** 42).
SQUIER, E. G.
Languages of Central and Southern America; **1** A 28.
STENGEL, F. A.
Historical development of the Spanish language; **3** 8.
The historical formation of the French language; **7** 42.
The history of the pronunciation of Latin; **4** 19.
The languages and dialects of Italy; **4** 13.
STEVENS, W. A.
On the substantive use of the Greek participle; III 45 (**3** 13).

Digitized by Google

STICKNEY, AUSTIN.
On the single case-form in Italian; VIII 87 (**8** 7).
STRATTON, M. H.
John Reuchlin and the *Epistulae obscurorum virorum;* **20** 34.
SWINTON, JOHN.
Linguistic perspective; **5** 35.
TARBELL, F. B.
Greek ideas as to the effect of burial on the future of the soul; XV 36 (**15** 35).
Phonetic law; XVII 5 (**17** 33).
TOY, C. H.
Modal development of the Shemitic verb; X 5 (**10** 27).
On Hebrew verb-etymology; VII 50 (**7** 41).
On Shemitic derived stems; **10** 22.
On the home of the primitive Semitic race; XII 26 (**12** 6).
On the nominal basis of the Hebrew verb; VIII 18 (**8** 29).
The Hebrew verb-termination *un;* XI 18 (**11** 28).
The Semitic personal pronouns; **13** 10.
The study of the Semitic languages (P. A.); **11** 10.
The Yoruban language; IX 19 (**9** 3).
TRUMBULL, J. H.
A mistaken view of the process of word-making in the American languages; **8** 32.
A mode of counting said to have been used by the Wawenoc Indians of Maine; **2** 13.
Contributions to the comparative grammar of the Algonkin languages; **2** 28.
Indian local names in Rhode Island; **3** 19.
Names for *heart, liver,* and *lungs;* **5** 31.
Names of the *sun* and of *water* in some American languages; **7** 45.
Notes on forty versions of the Lord's Prayer in Algonkin languages; III 113 (cf. **2** 28).
Notes on the migrations of the Dakotas; **8** 15.
On Algonkin names for *man;* II 138 (**2** 23).
On Algonkin names of the *dog* and the *horse;* **1** B 16.
On *cork, orchel,* and *jarrock;* **8** 19.
On numerals in American Indian languages, and the Indian mode of counting; V 41 (**5** 17); **7** 10.
On some mistaken notions of Algonkin grammar, and on mistranslations of words from Eliot's Bible; I 105 (**1** B 13).
On the Algonkin verb; VII 147 (**7** 28).
On the best method of studying the North American languages; I 55 (**1** A 25).
President's Address (1875); **6** 5.
The inflections of the Micmac verb; **9** 13.
The name *Oregon;* **9** 13.
Words derived from Indian languages of North America; III 19 (**3** 12).

Digitized by Google

TYLER, H. M.
The hero of the Iliad; **3** 17.
TYLER, W. S.
On the prepositions in the Homeric poems; V 5 (**5** 8).
VAN BENSCHOTEN, J. M.
Troy and Dr. Schliemann's discoveries; **5** 28.
VAN NAME, A.
Contributions to Creole grammar; I 123 (**1** B 13).
WARD, W. H.
Work and results of the Wolfe Expedition to Babylonia; **16** 29.
WARREN, MINTON.
On Latin glossaries, with especial reference to the codex Sangallensis 912; XV 124 (**15** 19).
The derivation of *merīdie;* **17** 32.
WEIDNER, R. F.
On some points connected with the prophecy of *Obadiah,* with a revised translation; **11** 16.
On the study of the Bible; **11** 21.
WELLS, B. W.
History of the *a*-vowel from Old Germanic to Modern English; XII 69 (**12** 10).
Long vowels and diphthongs in Old Germanic and Old English; XVIII 134 (**18** 21).
The ablaut in English; XIII 65 (**13** 34).
The ablaut in High German; XV 88 (**15** 24).
The development of the ablaut in Germanic; XIV 57 (**14** 5).
The sounds *o* and *u* in English; XVII 47 (**17** 10).
The vowels *e* and *i* in English; XVI 133 (**16** 23).
WEST, A. F.
The text of Richard de Bury's *Philobiblon;* **20** 17.
WHEELER, B. I.
Analogy, and the scope of its application in language; **17** 21.
WHEELER, J. R.
Cure inscriptions from Epidaurus; **19** 15.
WHITNEY, J. E.
The "continued allegory" in the first book of the *Fairy Queene;* XIX 40.
WHITNEY, W. D.
A botanico-philological problem; VII 73 (**7** 43).
A translation of the *Kaṭha Upanishad;* **17** 11.
Cockneyisms; **8** 26.
Further words as to surds and sonants; **13** 12.
Further words as to the law of economy as a phonetic force; **13** 12.
On combination and adaptation, as illustrated by the exchanges of primary and secondary suffixes; XV 111 (**15** 18).
On inconsistency in views of language; XI 92 (**11** 13).
On material and form in language; III 77 (**3** 23).
On mixture in language; XII 5 (**12** 13).

Digitized by Google

On roots; **17** 20.
On slighted vowels in English unaccented syllables; **14** 25.
On the nature and designation of the accent in Sanskrit; I 20 (**1** B 8).
On the present condition of the question as to the origin of language; I 84 (**1** B 18).
On the principle of economy as a phonetic force; VIII 123 (**8** 14).
On the relation of surd and sonant; VIII 41 (**8** 8).
Φύσει or *θέσει* — natural or conventional? V 95 (**5** 34).
President's Address (1870); **1** B 4.
Remarks upon quantity in English verse; **16** 7.
Remarks upon the neo-grammarians ("Junggrammatiker"); **16** 21.
Strictures on the views of August Schleicher respecting the nature of language and kindred subjects; II 35 (**2** 17).
The Indo-European case-system; XIII 88 (**13** 42).
The method of phonetic change in language; **17** 33.
The proportional elements of English utterance; **5** 14.
The question of Indo-European and Semitic relationship; **7** 26.
The relation of vowels and consonants, and certain inferences from it; **5** 26.
The roots of the Sanskrit language; XVI 5 (**16** 27).
The *siṣ* and *sa* aorists, or the sixth and seventh forms of aorist in Sanskrit; **16** 37.
The system of the Sanskrit verb; **7** 6.
The varieties of predication; XIV 36 (**14** 16).
What is articulation? **12** 21.

WIGHTMAN, J. C.
The form and force of the aorist tense in Greek; **13** 28.
The notation of the palatal sibilant in English; **7** 29.

WILLIAMS, ALONZO.
On verb-reduplication as a means of expressing completion action; VI 54 (**6** 12).

WILLIAMS, E. L.
Nomenclature of early California; **10** 34.

WRIGHT, J. H.
Date of the episode of Cylon in Athenian history; **19** 26.

Digitized by Google

INDEX II.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

VOLS. I–XX.

For the explanation of manner of reference, see Index I. This index has been compiled from the titles of papers, only such titles being omitted, of which no abstract was published.

AFRICAN LANGUAGES.

Agaou language; C. H. Brigham, **5** 33.

Ethiopic, see *sub voce*.

Papyrus, the great Harris, C. H. Brigham, **4** 10; Lafayette papyrus, **4** 10.

Reciprocal influence of languages developed amid ancient Mediterranean civilization; G. W. Samson, **3** 15.

Yoruban language; C. H. Toy, IX 19 (**9** 3).

AMERICAN LANGUAGES.

Algonkin: Comparative grammar of the Algonkin languages, contributions to; J. H. Trumbull, **2** 28.

mistaken notions of Algonkin grammar, and mistranslations of words from Eliot's Bible; J. H. Trumbull, I 105 (**1** B 13).

names of *dog* and *horse*, J. H. Trumbull, **1** B 16; names for *man*, J. H. Trumbull, II 138 (**2** 23).

notes on forty versions of the Lord's Prayer in Algonkin languages; J. H. Trumbull, III 113 (cf. **2** 28).

verb; VII 147 (**7** 28), J. H. Trumbull.

Central America, Indian languages of; E. C. Squier, **1** A 28.

Cheroki: affinity to Iroquois dialects; A. S. Gatschet, **16** 40.

Creole: Contributions to Creole grammar; A. Van Name, I 123 (**1** B 13).

Dakotas: beliefs, S. R. Riggs, **2** 5; migrations of the Dakotas, J. H. Trumbull, **8** 15; relationship of the Tuteloes to the Dakotan stock, J. Anderson, **2** 15.

Darien, see Caledonia Bay.

Destruction of aboriginal languages, measures to prevent; G. Gibbs, **1** A 27; E. S. Squier, **1** A 28.

Huron language and Huron-Iroquois traditions; H. Hall, **4** 24.

Indian languages, study of (P. A.); J. H. Trumbull, **6** 5.

Iroquois dialects, affinity of Cheroki to, A. S. Gatschet, **16** 40; Huron-Iroquois traditions, H. Hall, **4** 24.

Digitized by Google

AMERICAN LANGUAGES (continued).

Klamath language of Southwest Oregon, A. S. Gatschet, **15** 31; syllabic reduplication in, A. S. Gatschet, **10** 35.

Lingoa Geral or Modern Tupí of the Amazonas; C. F. Hartt, III 58.

Maskoki Indians; A. S. Gatschet, **15** 32.

Method of studying the North-American languages; J. H. Trumbull, I 55 (1 A 25); W. Matthews, **2** 26.

Micmac verb, inflections of; J. H. Trumbull, **9** 13.

Minitares Indians, language of; W. Matthews, **2** 26.

Numerals in American Indian languages, and the Indian mode of counting, G. Gibbs, **2** 25; J. H. Trumbull, V 41 (**5** 17), **7** 10; R. Ellis, **7** 8. Counting among the Wawenoc Indians, J. H. Trumbull, **2** 13.

Reduplication, syllabic, in Indian languages, and in the Klamath language of Southwest Oregon in particular; A. S. Gatschet, **10** 35.

Rhode Island, Indian local names in; J. H. Trumbull, **3** 19.

San Blas and Caledonia Bay, Darien, vocabulary of the language of the Indians of; E. P. Lull, IV 103 (**4** 7).

Sex-denoting nouns in American languages; A. S. Gatschet, XX 159 (**20** 45).

South America, Indian languages of, P. C. Bliss, **1** A 29; Central and South America, E. C. Squier, **1** A 28.

Structure of the Indian languages; T. Hurlburt, **1** A 26.

Sun, names of, in some American languages; J. H. Trumbull, **7** 45.

Tuteloes, relationship to the Dakotan stock; J. Anderson, **2** 15.

Verb, Algonkin; J. H. Trumbull, VII 147 (**7** 28).

Verb, inflections of the Micmac; J. H. Trumbull, **9** 13.

Verb, the substantive, in some North American languages; A. S. Gatschet, **15** 26.

Water, names of, in some American languages; J. H. Trumbull, **7** 45.

Wawenoc Indians of Maine, mode of counting said to have been used by; J. H. Trumbull, **2** 13.

Word making in American languages; J. H. Trumbull, **8** 32.

Words derived from Indian languages of North America; J. H. Trumbull, III 19 (**3** 12).

ANGLO-SAXON. See ENGLISH (*Language*).

ARABIC.

Arabic, Assyrian and Hebrew interrelation; M. Jastrow Jr., **17** 18.

ASSYRIAN.

Assyrian dictionary of Delitzsch; M. Jastrow Jr., **18** 12.

Assyrian, in its relation to Hebrew and Arabic; M. Jastrow Jr., **17** 18.

Babylonia, Wolfe expedition to; W. H. Ward, **16** 29.

AUSTRALIA.

Australian kinship; L. H. Morgan, **3** 15.

BIBLE.

See on Anglo-Saxon (under English), Testament (under Greek), Vulgate (under Latin), German, and Hebrew.

BULGARIAN. See SLAVONIC.

Digitized by Google

BURMAN. See TIBETO-BURMAN.
CELTIC.
Celtic elements in French; A. H. Mixer, **2** 21.
Isle of Man, language of; W. S. Kerruish, **12** 14.
Koch's treatment of the Celtic element in English; J. Hadley, IV 30.
Studies in Cymric philology; E. W. Evans, II 1 (**2** 22), III 5 (**3** 13), IV 20.
CHINESE.
China: language and dialects; H. McCartee, **1** B 15; R. H. Graves, **3** 11.
CREOLE.
Contributions to Creole grammar; A. Van Name, I 123 (**1** B 13).
ENGLISH.
Method of Study:
Critical study of the English language; Schele de Vere, **1** A 19.
in our academies and high schools; J. Pierson, **1** A 19.
in preparation for college; F. A. March, **20** 36.
in college; S. M. Shute, **4** 17.
Open questions in English philology; T. W. Hunt, **20** 19.
Language:
A, vowel, history of, from Old Germanic to Modern English; B. W. Wells, XII 69 (**12** 10).
Ablaut in English; B. W. Wells, XIII 65 (**13** 34); cf. under German.
Alfred's Laws, use of Anglo-Saxon particles in; C. P. G. Scott, **11** 24.
Alphabet of our colonial fathers, the written, J. B. Sewall, **13** 5; alphabet as a means to an end, W. C. Sawyer, **7** 36.
Anglo-Norman vowel system, relation of the, to the Norman words in English; H. C. G. von Jagemann, XV 66 (**15** 21).
Anglo-Saxon and Early English pronunciation; F. A. March, II 108 (**2** 12).
Anglo-Saxon Gospels, influence of Latin syntax in; W. B. Owen, XIII 59 (**13** 29).
Anglo-Saxon initial *p*; C. P. G. Scott, **13** 44.
Anglo-Saxon: Is there an Anglo-Saxon language? F. A. March, III 97 (**3** 20).
Anglo-Saxon particles in the Laws of Alfred; C. P. G. Scott, **11** 24.
Anglo-Saxon phonology, some points in; F. A. March, **11** 6.
Anglo-Saxon, some irregular verbs in; F. A. March, III 110 (**3** 21).
Anglo-Saxon translation of St. Luke's Gospel; W. B. Owen, **15** 26.
Anglo-Saxonum, codex diplomaticus, No. CCCXXVIII; F. A. March, **7** 42.
Arbútus, a new word; F. P. Brewer, **19** 27.
Cag, Keg: English vowel-mutation present in; S. S. Haldeman, V 26 (**5** 4).
California, nomenclature of early; E. L. Williams, **10** 34.
Celtic element in English, Koch's treatment of the; J. Hadley, IV 30.
Cockneyisms; W. D. Whitney, **8** 26.
Contamination as used in reference to Latin comedy; F. D. Allen, **19** 25.
Cork; J. H. Trumbull, **8** 19.

Digitized by Google

ENGLISH (continued).

Dictionary of the English Philological Society; F. A. March, **10** 23, **11** 26; C. K. Nelson, **18** 5.

Diphthongs and long vowels in Old Germanic and Old English; B. W. Wells, XVIII 134 (**18** 21).

E, the vowels *e* and *i* in English; B. W. Wells, XVI 133 (**16** 23).

Early English and Anglo-Saxon pronunciation; F. A. March, II 108 (**2** 12); Ellis's Early English pronunciation; C. A. Bristed, II 114 (**2** 11).

Election, the word, in American politics; F. P. Brewer, **17** 7.

English and German: the kindred Germanic words of German and English, exhibited with reference to their consonantal relations; A. H. Edgren, XI 113 (**11** 8).

English vowel quantity in the thirteenth century and in the nineteenth; J. Hadley, II 65 (**2** 10).

Etymology, illustrations in; G. F. Comfort, **3** 18.

First two; F. A. March, **13** 30.

Gender survival in *this* and *that;* L. S. Potwin, **17** 29.

Grimm's Law, recent discussion of; F. A. March, IV 80 (**4** 22).

Heart, names for; J. H. Trumbull, **5** 31.

I, the vowels *e* and *i* in English; B. W. Wells, XVI 133 (**16** 23).

Imperfect tenses of the passive voice; F. E. Hall, **2** 6.

Jarrock; J. H. Trumbull, **8** 19.

Juise, pronunciation in Webster and Worcester; W. A. Goodwin, **6** 26.

L and *u*, supposed mutation; S. S. Haldeman, VII 172 (**7** 5).

Law, Roman elements in English; H. L. Baker, **20** 22.

Linguistic authorities, their influence upon spoken English; F. A. March, **15** 35.

Liver, *Lungs*, names for; J. H. Trumbull, **5** 31.

Meter of *Paradise Lost;* F. A. March, **20** 13.

Metrical art, the elements of, with special reference to the construction of the English heroic verse; A. Ford, **3** 14.

Metrical observations on a Northumbrianized version of the Old English *Judith;* A. S. Cook, XX 172.

Mother-tongue, our duty to our (P. A.), J. B. Sewall, **10** 6; the acquisition of a double, F. P. Brewer, **10** 61.

Mutation between *l* and *u*, on a supposed; S. S. Haldeman, VII 172 (**7** 5); mutation in *cag*, *keg;* S. S. Haldeman, VI 20 (**6** 4).

Negro English; J. A. Harrison, **16** 31.

Neo-grammarians; F. A. March, **16** 19; W. D. Whitney, **16** 21.

New words, register of; F. P. Brewer, XIX 79.

Norman words in English, and the relation of the Anglo-Norman vowel system thereto; H. C. G. von Jagemann, XV 66 (**15** 21).

Number of words used in speaking and writing English; E. S. Holden, **6** 4.

O as pronounced in New England; E. S. Sheldon, **14** 19.

O and *u*, the sounds, in English; B. W. Wells, XVII 47 (**17** 10).

Digitized by Google

ENGLISH (continued).
Once-used words in Shakespeare; F. A. March, **17** 30.
Orchel; J. H. Trumbull, **8** 19.
Oregon, the name; J. H. Trumbull, **9** 13.
Paresis, words formed by; S. S. Haldeman, **11** 8.
Particles in the Laws of Alfred; C. P. G. Scott, **11** 24.
Passive voice, imperfect tenses of; F. E. Hall, **2** 6.
Pennsylvania German, see German.
"*Philanthropy*"; T. W. Higginson, **5** 20.
Phonology, some points in Anglo-Saxon; F. A. March, **11** 6.
Proof, Prove: English consonant-mutation; S. S. Haldeman, VI 20 (**6** 4).
Pronunciation: Anglo-Saxon and Early English; F. A. March, **2** 12.
Pronunciation near Fredericksburg, Va.; S. Primer, **20** 25.
Pronunciation, notes on Ellis's Early English; C. A. Bristed II 114 (**2** 11).
Pronunciation of *o* in New England; E. S. Sheldon, **14** 19.
Pronunciation of Standard English, how learned; F. A. March, XIX 70 (**19** 16).
Proportional elements of English utterance; W. D. Whitney, **5** 14.
Quantity in English verse; T. D. Goodell, XVI 78 (**16** 6). See also Verse.
Quantity of vowels in the thirteenth and in the nineteenth century; J. Hadley, II 65 (**2** 10).
Shall and *will;* G. P. Garrison, **20** 20.
Sibilant, notation of the palatal, in English; J. C. Wightman, **7** 29.
Slighted vowels in unaccented syllables; W. D. Whitney, **14** 25.
Southernisms; C. F. Smith, XIV 42 (**14** 5), XVII 34 (**17** 23).
Specific use of English words; G. F. Comfort, **4** 26.
Spelling reform, S. S. Haldeman, **3** 22 and P. A. **8** 17; J. W. Shearer, **7** 36; spellings of the Philological Society, F. A. March, XII 52 (**12** 25); list of amended spellings, F. A. March, XVII 127 (**17** 41).
Spelling reform, report of committee on: **7** 35, **8** 31, **9** 5, **10** 29, **11** 4, **12** 25, **13** 38, **14** 29, **15** 41, **16** 47, **17** 41, **18** 30, **19** 30, **20** 34.
Spoken English as influenced by written English and by linguistic authorities; F. A. March, **15** 35.
Spurious words; S. S. Haldeman, **10** 17.
Standard English: its pronunciation, how learned; F. A. March, **18** 10, XIX 70 (**19** 16).
Stressed vowels in Ælfric's *Homilies;* A. S. Cook, XX 175.
Such, erroneous and doubtful usages of the word; C. A. Bristed, III 55 (**3** 5).
Suffix *ist;* F. P. Brewer, **6** 28.
Surnames: derivation of English monosyllabic personal; W. W. Fowler, **3** 10.
This and *That*, survival of gender in; L. S. Potwin, **17** 29.
Two first; F. A. March, **13** 30.
U, the sounds *o* and *u* in English; B. W. Wells, XVII 47 (**17** 10).

Digitized by Google

ENGLISH (continued).

U and *l*, a supposed mutation; S. S. Haldeman, VII 172 (**7** 5).

Utterance, the proportional elements of English; W. D. Whitney, **5** 14.

Verb: certain forms of the English verb which were used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; T. R. Lounsbury, I 95 (**1** B 10).

Verbs: some irregular verbs in Anglo-Saxon; F. A. March, III 110 (**3** 21).

Verse: dactylic hexameters, personal element in; F. A. March, **14** 26; W. T. Hewett, **14** 29.

Verse, harmonies of; F. A. March, **14** 11.

Verse, heroic, elements of metrical art, with special reference to the construction of; A. Ford, **3** 14.

Verse: hexameters, personal element in dactylic; F. A. March, **14** 26; W. T. Hewett, **14** 29.

Verse, quantity in; T. D. Goodell, **16** 6; W. D. Whitney, **16** 7; F. A. March, **16** 8; T. D. Seymour, XVI 78 (**16** 6).

Verse, theories of English; J. C. Parsons, **19** 18; T. D. Goodell, **19** 21; T. R. Price, **19** 22.

Vowel quantity, see Quantity.

Vowels (long) and diphthongs in Old Germanic and Old English; B. W. Wells, XVIII 134 (**18** 21).

Vowels slighted in unaccented syllables; W. D. Whitney, **14** 25.

Vowels, stressed, in Ælfric's *Homilies;* A. S. Cook, XX 175.

Vowel system, relation of the Anglo-Norman, to the Norman words in English; H. C. G. von Jagemann, XV 66 (**15** 21).

Will and *shall;* G. P. Garrison, **20** 20.

Words new, register of; F. P. Brewer, XIX 79.

Words, once-used, in Shakespeare; F. A. March, **17** 30.

Words, specific use of some; G. F. Comfort, **4** 26.

Words, spurious; S. S. Haldeman, **10** 17.

Written English, its influence upon spoken English; F. A. March, **15** 36.

Literature:

Ælfric's *Homilies*, stressed vowels in; A. S. Cook, XX 175.

Anglo-Saxon Gospels, influence of the Latin syntax in the, W. B. Owen, XIII 59 (**13** 29); Anglo-Saxon translation of St. Luke's Gospel, W. B. Owen, **15** 26.

Anglo-Saxonum, remarks on No. CCXXVIII of the Codex Diplomaticus; F. A. March, **7** 42.

Beowulf, the world of; F. A. March, **13** 21.

Chaucer's *Cecilia;* W. A. Goodwin, **10** 15.

Judith, the Northumbrianized text version, metrical observations on; A. S. Cook, XX 172.

Milton: Meter of *Paradise Lost;* F. A. March, **20** 13.

Shakespeare: Hamlet's *dram of eale* and what it *doth;* C. P. G. Scott, **14** 22; F. A. March, **14** 24.

immaturity as shown in Hamlet; F. A. March, **6** 28.

King Lear, the point of view in; F. A. March, **11** 6.

Digitized by Google

ENGLISH (continued).
knowledge of horsemanship — a new reading of *Macbeth*, I 7; J. B. Bittinger, **7** 39.
Macbeth, I 7; J. B. Bittinger, **7** 39.
once-used words in; F. A. March, **17** 30.
Othello, a confession about; F. A. March, **12** 31.
Winter's Tale, the dramatic features of; T. R. Price, **20** 21.
Spenser. The "Continued Allegory" in the first book of the *Fairy Queene;* J. E. Whitney, XIX 40.
The Owl and the Nightingale: a grammatical analysis of; L. A. Sherman, VI 69 (**6** 30).
ETHIOPIC.
Ethiopic MS.; C. H. Brigham, **5** 3.
Wise Philosopher, Cornill's examination of the Aethiopic book of the; C. H. Brigham, **7** 19.
ETRUSCAN.
Etruscan researches of Isaac Taylor; R. P. Keep, **5** 29.
FRENCH.
French language, historical formation of; F. Stengel, **7** 42.
The Celtic elements in French; A. H. Mixer, **2** 21.
GERMAN.
Language:
A, vowel, history of, from Old Germanic to Modern English; B. W. Wells, XII 69 (**12** 10).
Ablaut in Germanic, the development of the; B. W. Wells, XIV 57 (**14** 5); in High German, XV 88 (**15** 24); cf. XIII 65 (**13** 34).
Alphabet, the Roman, in German; H. C. G. Brandt, **9** 8.
German and English: the kindred Germanic words of, exhibited with reference to their consonantal relations; A. H. Edgren, XI 113 (**11** 8).
Gothic initial *þ;* C. P. G. Scott, **13** 44.
Grimm's law, recent discussions of; F. A. March, IV 80 (**4** 22).
Pennsylvania German; S. S. Haldeman, I 80 (**1** B 11); L. L. Grumbine, **17** 12.
P, initial, in Gothic and Anglo-Saxon; C. P. G. Scott, **13** 44.
Structure of the German sentence; C. W. Ernst, **6** 16.
Verb: Begemann's views as to the weak preterite of the Germanic verbs; F. Carter, VI 22 (**6** 23).
Verse, the personal element in dactylic hexameters; W. T. Hewett, **14** 29.
Vowels (long) and diphthongs in Old Germanic and Old English; B. W. Wells, XVIII 134 (**18** 21).
Vowels, pronunciation of German; C. W. Ernst, **5** 19.
Literature:
Goethe's Homeric studies; G. M. Richardson, **19** 16.
Heliand, studies in the; A. S. Cook, X 60 (**10** 28).
Kürenberg hypothesis, on the; F. Carter, VIII 134.
Nibelungenlied: On Wilmanns' theory of the authorship of; F. Carter, VIII 94 (**8** 11).

Digitized by Google

GERMAN (continued).
Schiller's *Tell*, Helveticisms in; G. F. Comfort, **5** 32.
Ulfilas, the Gothic Bible of; C. K. Nelson, **16** 37.
GOTHIC. See GERMAN.
GREEK.
Language:
Accent, nature and theory of; J. Hadley, I 1 (**1** B 7).
Affixes in Greek, peculiarities of; C. S. Halsey, **19** 23.
Andocides, notes on; W. S. Scarborough, **20** 5.
Aorist, form and force; J. C. Wightman, **13** 28.
Aorist participle, how translated; A. C. Kendrick, **1** B 17.
Aorist participle, temporal coincidence of, with the primary verb; A. C. Merriam, **8** 4.
Aorist participle, use of; T. D. Seymour, XII 88 (**12** 24).
Aorist subjunctive and future indicative with ὅπως and οὐ μή; W. W. Goodwin, I 46 (**1** B 9).
Arcado-Cyprian dialect; H. W. Smyth, XVIII 59, 158 (**18** 27).
Article as a pronoun; L. A. Sherman, **9** 18.
Aspirates, pronunciation of; A. C. Kendrick, **2** 27.
Caesura in Homer, the feminine; T. D. Seymour, XVI 30 (**16** 38).
Caesura, nature of; M. W. Humphreys, X 25 (**10** 11).
Commands, negative, in Greek; M. W. Humphreys, VII 46 (**7** 19).
Conditional sentences: in Aeschylus, E. B. Clapp, XVIII 43 (**18** 11); classification of, W. W. Goodwin, IV 60 (**4** 14); distinction between the subjunctive and optative in, J. B. Sewall, V 77 (**5** 10), cf. **9** 19; some forms of, C. D. Morris, VI 44 (**6** 27); some forms of, in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit, J. B. Greenough, II 159 (**2** 28).
Cyprus, dialect of, I. H. Hall, **17** 7; H. W. Smyth, XVIII 59, 158 (**18** 27); declension of definite article, I. H. Hall, XI 51 (**11** 19); modern Greek language in Cyprus, F. P. Brewer, **8** 9.
Dative in Sophocles; A. Fairbanks, XVII 78 (**17** 25).
Declension, the so-called Attic second; F. D. Allen, II 18 (**2** 12).
Dialects. See *Arcadia*, *Cyprus*, *Ionic*, *Northern Greece*.
εἰ with the future indicative and ἐάν with the subjunctive in the tragic poets; B. L. Gildersleeve, VII 5 (**7** 17).
Elision, certain effects of; M. W. Humphreys, X 32 (**10** 16).
Elision, especially in Greek; M. W. Humphreys, IX 84 (**9** 26).
Epsilon class of verbs; W. W. Goodwin, **10** 34.
Future indicative: with εἰ, and ἐάν with subjunctive in the tragic poets, B. L. Gildersleeve, VII 5 (**7** 17); with ὅπως and οὐ μή, W. W. Goodwin, I 46 (**1** B 9); with οὐ μή in prohibitions; C. D. Morris, **13** 35.
Future-perfect time, expressions of; W. W. Goodwin, **8** 22.
Genitive case in Sophocles; T. D. Goodell, XV 5 (**15** 14).
Homer: feminine caesura in, T. D. Seymour, XVI 30 (**16** 38); φίλος, A. C. Merriam, **9** 15; prepositions, W. S. Tyler, V 5 (**5** 8).

Digitized by Google

GREEK (continued).
Indicative; J. B. Sewall, **9** 19.
Infinitive, contributions to the history of the articular; B. L. Gildersleeve, IX 5 (**9** 24).
Intrusion between article and noun, alien; A. C. Merriam, XIII 34 (**13** 25).
Ionic, the vowel system of; H. W. Smyth, XX 5 (**20** 42).
μή, encroachments upon οὐ in later Greek; B. L. Gildersleeve, **10** 31.
Negative commands, see Commands.
Negatives; A. Sander, **10** 18. See also οὐ and μή.
Northern Greece, dialects of; H. W. Smyth, **17** 14.
Nu movable, origin of; F. P. Brewer, **12** 22.
Optative; J. B. Sewall, V 77 (**5** 10), **9** 19.
Orators' use of πρίν; B. L. Gildersleeve, **12** 23.
ὡς: a certain apparently pleonastic use of; F. D. Allen, VIII 38 (**8** 12).
οὐ encroached upon by μή in later Greek; B. L. Gildersleeve, **10** 31.
οὐ μή with future in prohibitions; C. D. Morris, **13** 35; W. W. Goodwin, I 46 (**1** B 9).
Participle aorist, how translated, A. C. Kendrick, **1** B 7;
temporal coincidence of, with primary verb, A. C. Merriam, **8** 4;
use of, T. D. Seymour, XII 88 (**12** 24).
Participle: substantive use of; W. A. Stevens, III 45 (**3** 13).
φίλος, the Homeric; A. C. Merriam, **9** 15.
Prepositions in the Homeric poems; W. S. Tyler, V 5 (**5** 8).
πρίν in the orators; B. L. Gildersleeve, **12** 23.
Prohibitions, οὐ μή with future in; C. D. Morris, **13** 35; W. W. Goodwin, I 46 (**1** B 9). See Commands.
Pronoun, the article as a; L. A. Sherman, **9** 18.
Pronunciation; J. B. Feuling, **1** A 11; S. S. Haldeman, **1** A 11; C. A. Bristed, **1** A 12; A. N. Arnold, **1** A 12; report of committee on, **1** A 21; of the aspirates, A. C. Kendrick, **2** 27.
Pronunciation: the Byzantine Greek, of the tenth century, as illustrated from a MS. in the Bodleian Library; J. Hadley, III 33 (**3** 5).
Rime in Latin and Greek poetry; J. B. Feuling, **8** 9.
SHALL and SHOULD in protasis, and their Greek equivalents; W. W. Goodwin, VII 87 (**7** 15), **8** 23.
σις, verbal abstract nouns in, in Thucydides; E. G. Sihler, XII 96 (**12** 16).
Sophocles, the dative case in, A. Fairbanks, XVII 78 (**17** 25); genitive case in, T. D. Goodell, XV 5 (**15** 14).
Subjunctive: distinguished from optative, J. B. Sewall, V 77 (**5** 10) **9** 19;
aorist subjunctive and future indicative with ὅπως and οὐ μή, W. W. Goodwin, I 46 (**1** B 9).
with ἐάν, and future indicative with εἰ in the tragic poets, B. L. Gildersleeve, VII 5 (**7** 17).
Thematic vowel; W. S. Scarborough, **15** 6.
Thessaly: inscription from Larisa; J. Sachs, **14** 17.
Thucydides: verbal abstract nouns in -σις in; E. G. Sihler, XII 96 (**12** 16).

Digitized by Google

GREEK (continued).
Tmesis, so-called; T. D. Seymour, **14** 25.
Verbs, epsilon class of, W. W. Goodwin, **10** 34; in *δω*, epic forms of, F. D. Allen, IV 5 (**4** 16); Plato's use of verbs of *saying;* G. B. Hussey, **20** 37.
Vowel system of Ionic; H. W. Smyth, XX 5 (**20** 42).
Vowel, thematic; W. S. Scarborough, **15** 6.
Literature:
Aeschines' reticence; R. B. Richardson, **18** 9.
Aeschylus: account of the battle of Salamis, contrasted with that of Herodot., E. G. Sihler, VIII 109 (**8** 6);
conditional sentences in, E. B. Clapp, XVIII 43 (**18** 11);
date of the *Prometheus*, T. D. Seymour, X 111 (**10** 19);
the text and interpretation of certain passages in the *Agamemnon*, W. W. Goodwin, VIII 69 (**8** 12).
Andocides, notes on; W. S. Scarborough, **20** 5.
Apostles, teaching of the Twelve (*διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*); C. K. Nelson, **15** 36.
Aristophanes: *Acharnians* 849, F. W. Nicholson, **20** 20;
and low comedy, A. Emerson, **17** 38;
Birds, theory of interpretation, W. S. Scarborough, **17** 7.
Aristotle: *Psychology*, transl. by Wallace; C. K. Nelson, **14** 18.
Ars Rhetorica and Dionysius Hal.; E. G. Sihler, **10** 4.
Comedy, historical aspects of Old Attic; E. G. Sihler, **7** 15.
Comedy (low) and Aristophanes; A. Emerson, **17** 38.
Cynicus of Lucian, authorship of; J. Bridge, XIX 33 (**19** 29).
Demosthenes: *De Corona*, § 262, F. P. Brewer, **7** 41;
chronology of some events mentioned in the *De Corona*, W. W. Goodwin, **2** 24;
documents in the *De Corona*, M. L. D'Ooge, **5** 12;
original recension of the *De Corona*, M. L. D'Ooge, X 92 (**10** 24);
Hero physician and Hero *καλαμίτης*, mentioned by, W. W. Goodwin, **4** 24.
Dinarchus, a study of; E. G. Sihler, XVI 120 (**16** 34).
Dinarchus *c. Dem.* 28 and *c. Aristog.* 15; E. G. Sihler, **16** 40.
Diogenes Laertius and Lucian; E. G. Sihler, **11** 5.
Dionysius Hal. and the *Ars Rhetorica;* E. G. Sihler, **10** 4.
Euripides: *Cyclops* 507 emended, T. D. Seymour, **13** 40;
Suppl. 1049, E. G. Sihler, **16** 40.
Herodotus' account of the battle of Salamis, contrasted with that of Aeschylus; E. G. Sihler, VIII 109 (**8** 6).
Herodotus, VIII 124; E. G. Sihler, **16** 40.
Hesiod: an unpublished introduction to the *Works and Days;* I. H. Hall, **16** 24.
Homer: equestrianism in the *Doloneia*, B. Perrin, XVI 104 (**16** 9);
feminine caesura in, T. D. Seymour, XVI 30 (**16** 38);
fatalism, W. S. Scarborough, **16** 36;

Digitized by Google

GREEK (continued).
Geddes' *Problem of the Homeric Poems*, L. R. Packard, **10** 27;
Grote's theory of the structure of the *Iliad*, L. R. Packard, VII 24 (**7** 18);
Iliad: hero of the, H. M. Tyler, **3** 17; Ζ 372–377, T. D. Seymour, **19** 25;
Odyssey: on a passage in (κ 81–86), L. R. Packard, V 31 (**5** 11);
ζ 35, 244–245, 276–288, η 311–316, A. C. Merriam, **10** 8;
φίλος in Homer, A. C. Merriam, **9** 15;
prepositions, W. S. Tyler, V 5 (**5** 8).
zoölogy of Homer, J. Sachs, XVII 17 (**17** 14);
Homer and Strabo; E. G. Sihler, **12** 4.
Homeric studies of Goethe; G. M. Richardson, **19** 16.
Inscriptions (P. A.), A. C. Merriam, **18** 7; from Larisa, J. Sachs, **14** 17; from Epidaurus, J. R. Wheeler, **19** 15.
Literature, beginning of a written, in Greece; L. R. Packard, XI 34 (**11** 25).
Lucian, authorship of the *Cynicus;* J. Bridge, XIX 33 (**19** 29).
Lucian, Diogenes Laertius and the tradition of the Oriental descent of Greek philosophy; E. G. Sihler, **11** 5.
Lucian: observations on; J. Sachs, XI 66 (**11** 9).
Orpheus, an ancient Bulgarian poem on; C. F. Morse, **2** 27.
Plato: Certain passages in the *Phaedo* and the *Gorgias*, L. R. Packard, VIII 5 (**8** 21);
observations on the *Cratylus*, J. Sachs, IX 59 (**9** 13);
verbs of *saying* in Plato, G. B. Hussey, **20** 37.
Plato and Virgil; E. G. Sihler, XI 72 (**11** 33).
Plutarch, a new source of Plutarch's Life of Cicero; A. Gudeman, XX 139 (**20** 36).
Plutarch, *vit. Lyc.* **13** 5; E. G. Sihler, **16** 40.
Sophocles: Antigone, *v.* 453–455, W. W. Goodwin, **7** 4; *v.* 572, M. L. D'Ooge, **12** 29; her guilt or innocence, M. L. D'Ooge, **14** 18; dative in, A. W. Fairbanks, XVII 78 (**17** 25); genitive in, T. D. Goodell, XV 5 (**15** 14).
Strabo and Homer; E. G. Sihler, **12** 4.
Testament, the Greek New, as published in America; I. H. Hall, XIII 5 (**13** 23), **14** 3.
Theocritus I 95–96; T. D. Seymour, **13** 41.
Thucydides: I 11, M. W. Humphreys, **13** 27; I 50, 1, II 37, 1, E. G. Sihler, **16** 40; VI 17 (ἀνέλπιστοι), Grote on, W. S. Scarborough, **18** 5;
verbal nouns in -σις, E. G. Sihler, XII 96 (**12** 16);
some points in the life of, L. R. Packard, IV 47 (**4** 4).
Tragedy: Appeal to the sense of sight in; R. B. Richardson, XVI 41 (**16** 22).
Xenophon: age of, at the time of the Anabasis, C. D. Morris, V 82 (**5** 25);
Anabasis I 1, 8; 4, 15; 5, 11; 8, 15; 8, 16; 9, 8; 9, 10; 10, 10; II 6, 29; III 2, 10; 2, 26; 2, 34; IV 4, 14; 6, 13, E. G. Sihler, **16** 40;
inaccuracies in Grote's narrative of the retreat of the Ten Thousand, F. P. Brewer, **2** 4;

Digitized by Google

GREEK (continued).
composition of the *Cynegeticus*, T. D. Seymour, IX 69 (**9** 28).
History, Manners, Customs, etc.:
Aphrodite's smile, Theocr. I 95–96; T. D. Seymour, **13** 41.
Athens: recent (1873) excavations in Athens; F. P. Brewer, **4** 25.
Burial, effect of, on the future of the soul; F. B. Tarbell, XV 36 (**15** 35).
Crete: law code of Gortyna; A. C. Merriam, **16** 34.
Cure inscriptions from Epidaurus; J. R. Wheeler, **19** 15.
Cylon: date of the episode of, in Athenian history; J. H. Wright, **19** 26.
Cyprus and Troy; A. C. Merriam, **6** 19.
Δίκη in the Greek theosophy, force of; C. K. Nelson, **14** 9.
Equestrianism in the *Doloneia;* B. Perrin, XVI 104 (**16** 9).
Gortyna, law code; A. C. Merriam, **16** 34.
Hanging among the Greeks; T. D. Seymour, **15** 16.
Hephaestus, the tripods of; T. D. Seymour, **19** 25.
Hero physician and Hero καλαμίτης in Demosthenes; W. W. Goodwin, **4** 24.
Homeric zoölogy; J. Sachs, XVII 17 (**17** 14).
Law code of Gortyna; A. C. Merriam, **16** 34.
Monasteries of Mt. Athos; R. P. Keep, **15** 23.
Morality and religion of the Greeks (P. A.); L. R. Packard, **12** 7.
Mt. Athos; R. P. Keep, **15** 23.
Philosophy, tradition of the Oriental descent of; E. G. Sihler, **11** 5.
Πρόεδροι. See πρυτάνεις.
Πρυτάνεις, relation of the πρόεδροι to the, in the Athenian senate; W. W. Goodwin, XVI 165 (**16** 35).
Religion and morality of the Greeks (P. A.); L. R. Packard, **12** 7.
Salamis, Herodotus's and Aeschylus's accounts of the battle of; E. G. Sihler, VIII 109 (**8** 6).
Senate, the Athenian: relation of the πρόεδροι to the πρυτάνεις in the; W. W. Goodwin, XVI 165 (**16** 35).
Schliemann's discoveries at Troy; J. M. Van Benschoten, **5** 28.
Sight, appeal to the sense of, in Greek tragedy; R. B. Richardson, XVI 41 (**16** 22).
Soul, Greek ideas as to the effect of burial on the future of the; F. B. Tarbell, XV 36 (**15** 35).
Swearing, irreverence in; A. D. Savage, **9** 27.
Talent, value of the Attic, in modern money; W. W. Goodwin, XVI 116 (**16** 22).
Tripods of Hephaestus; T. D. Seymour, **19** 25.
Troy and Cyprus; A. C. Merriam, **6** 19.
Troy and Dr. Schliemann's discoveries; J. M. Van Benschoten, **5** 28.
Tunnels, ancient; A. C. Merriam, **16** 51.
Written literature in Greece, the beginning of; L. R. Packard, XI 34 (**11** 25).
Zoölogy, notes on Homeric; J. Sachs, XVII 17 (**17** 14).

Digitized by Google

HEBREW.

Article הַ, origin of; G. R. Entler, **7** 4.

Ashtôreth, the Canaanitish goddess, new etymology; J. S. Blackwell, **17** 8.

Bible, study of; R. F. Weidner, **11** 21.

Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, comparative view of language; G. R. Entler, **6** 9.

Epistle to the Hebrews, authorship; C. K. Nelson, **17** 31, **18** 9.

Exodus xxviii. 17–20; J. S. Blackwell, **12** 11.

Hebrew, Assyrian and Arabic, interrelation; M. Jastrow Jr., **17** 18.

Hebrew words in Latin glossary Codex Sangallensis 912; C. Adler, **17** 4.

MS. of the fourteenth century A.D., some peculiarities of; C. Adler, **15** 33.

Obadiah, prophecy of; R. F. Weidner, **11** 16.

Reciprocal influences of languages developed amid ancient Mediterranean civilization; G. W. Samson, **3** 15.

Shapira Hebrew roll in Philadelphia; C. Adler, **15** 41.

Stones, precious, of the Jewish high-priest's breastplate, Exod. xxviii. 17–20; J. S. Blackwell, **12** 11.

Talmud, testimony of, respecting the pronunciation of Latin *c* and *s*; J. S. Blackwell, **12** 5.

Verb-etymology; C. H. Toy, VII 50 (**7** 41).

Verb, modal development of Semitic; C. H. Toy, X 5 (**10** 27).

Verb, nominal basis of the; C. H. Toy, VIII 18 (**8** 29).

Verb-termination *un*; C. H. Toy, XI 18 (**11** 28).

ITALIAN.

Language and dialects; F. Stengel, **4** 13.

The single case-form in Italian; A. Stickney, VIII 87 (**8** 7).

LANGUAGE, Science of. See also under PHONETICS.

Adaptation and combination, as illustrated by the exchanges of primary and secondary suffixes; W. D. Whitney, XV 111 (**15** 18).

Analogy and the scope of its application in language; B. I. Wheeler, **17** 21.

Aphasia; M. W. Easton, **4** 11.

Articulation; W. D. Whitney, **12** 21; S. Porter, **16** 45.

Assibilation, forms of; W. S. Liscomb, **8** 28.

Botanico-philological problem; W. D. Whitney, VII 73 (**7** 43).

Case-system, the Indo-European; W. D. Whitney, XIII 88 (**13** 42).

Children, vocabularies of; E. S. Holden, VIII 58 (**8** 23); M. W. Humphreys, XI 5 (**11** 18).

Cognate words, to be distinguished from words that are identical; L. S. Potwin, **19** 32.

Combination. See *Adaptation*.

Comparative philology, some exaggerations in; C. A. Bristed, **3** 22.

Dissimilated gemination; F. A. March, **6** 21, VIII 145.

Economy as a phonetic force, the principle of; W. D. Whitney, VIII 123 (**8** 14); the law of, **13** 12.

Digitized by Google

LANGUAGE (continued).
Etymology, ideological, as a distinct method in philology; S. P. Andrews, **10** 4.
Etymology, illustrations in; G. F. Comfort, **3** 18.
Faculty of speech, acts attributed to; F. A. March, **7** 43.
Gemination, dissimilated; F. A. March, **6** 21, VIII 145.
Genealogy of words; M. W. Easton, XVI 54 (**16** 21).
Grammatical terms, a concise system of, according to the teachings of comparative philology; A. Douai, **4** 11.
Grimm's Law, recent discussions of; F. A. March, IV 80 (**4** 22).
Identity of words; L. S. Potwin, **19** 32.
Impersonal, see *Verbs*.
Inconsistency in views of language, W. D. Whitney, XI 92 (**11** 13).
Indo-European and Semitic relationship, the question of; W. D. Whitney, **7** 26.
Infantile linguistic, see *Children*.
Instinct in acts attributed to the faculty of speech; F. A. March, **7** 43.
Invention of words; S. S. Haldeman, **11** 18.
Language (P. A.); H. Crosby, **2** 8.
Language in its scientific, its æsthetic, and its historical relations (P. A.); A. C. Kendrick, **4** 8.
Language, relation of, to education, J. McCosh, **1** A 29; to national culture and education (P. A.), A. C. Kendrick, **3** 7.
Law, phonetic; F. B. Tarbell, XVII 5 (**17** 33).
Linguistic perspective; J. Swinton, **5** 35.
Material and form in language; W. D. Whitney, III 77 (**3** 23).
Method of phonetic change in language; W. D. Whitney, **17** 33; F. A. March, **17** 36.
Method, the embryological, in the study of language; G. W. Samson, **1** B 19.
Mixture in language; W. D. Whitney, XII 5 (**12** 13).
Mother-tongue, the acquisition of a double; F. P. Brewer, **4** 21.
Nature of language: strictures on the views of August Schleicher respecting the, and kindred subjects; W. D. Whitney, II 35 (**2** 17).
Neo-grammarians; F. A. March, **16** 19; W. D. Whitney, **16** 21.
Number of words used in speaking and writing English; E. S. Holden, **6** 4.
Origin of language; F. A. March, **2** 18.
Origin of language: Present (1869–70) condition of the question as to the; W. D. Whitney, I 84 (**1** B 18).
Paradoxes in language; W. W. Fowler, **5** 4.
Paresis, words formed by; S. S. Haldeman, **11** 8.
Passive forms in languages of the Aryan family, disused and replaced by reflexive forms; A. B. Hyde, **1** B 12.
Phonetic change in language, method of; W. D. Whitney, **17** 33; F. A. March, **17** 36.
Phonetic force, the law of economy as a; W. D. Whitney, VIII 123 (**8** 14) **13** 12.

Digitized by Google

LANGUAGE (continued).
Phonetic law; F. B. Tarbell, XVII 5 (**17** 33).
Φύσει or Θέσει — natural or conventional? W. D. Whitney, V 95 (**5** 34).
Predicate and subject: nature of the distinction; S. Porter, **7** 21.
Predication, the varieties of; W. D. Whitney, XIV 36 (**14** 16).
Reflexive forms replace disused passive forms in Aryan languages; A. B. Hyde, **1** B 12.
Roots; W. D. Whitney, **17** 20.
Schleicher's views of language, strictures on; W. D. Whitney, II 35 (**2** 17).
Sign-language as indicating the law of vocal and written language; G. W. Samson, **2** 19.
Speech, music in; M. L. Rouse, **18** 34.
Subject and predicate, nature of the distinction; S. Porter, **7** 21.
Substantive verb, the term; S. Porter, **7** 21.
Suffixes, primary and secondary: combination and adaptation as illustrated by the exchange of; W. D. Whitney, XV 111 (**15** 18).
Verb of existence, the term; S. Porter, **7** 21.
Verb-reduplication as a means of expressing completed action; A. Williams, VI 54 (**6** 12).
Verbs, impersonal; J. Goebel, XIX 20 (**19** 29).
Volapük; F. A. March, **19** 18.

LATIN.
Language:
Accent, influences of, in iambic trimeters, M. W. Humphreys, VII 107 (**7** 45); in dactylic hexameters, M. W. Humphreys, IX 39 (**9** 14).
Affixes in Latin, peculiarities of; C. S. Halsey, **19** 23.
Alliteration; T. Peck, XV 58 (**15** 22).
Alphabet, the Roman, in German; H. C. G. Brandt, **9** 8.
Ancipiti in Caesar, *B. G.* I 26; W. S. Scarborough, **18** 38.
Cicero's *De legibus*, peculiarities of diction and syntax; W. A. Merrill, **18** 31.
Codex Sangallensis 912, Hebrew words in; C. Adler, **17** 4. See *Glossaries.*
Conditional sentences: Some forms of, in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit, J. B. Greenough, II 159 (**2** 28).
Contamination, the term used in reference to comedy; F. D. Allen, **19** 25.
Cum constructions; W. G. Hale, **18** 21.
Etymologies of Lactantius; W. C. Cattell, **11** 17.
Glossaries, with especial reference to the codex Sangallensis 912; M. Warren, XV 124 (**15** 19).
Grammar, present (1874) condition of, G. Fischer, **5** 23; reconstructed on philological and analytical principles, B. W. Dwight, **1** B 22.
Hexameters, Vergil's; S. S. Haldeman, **9** 6.
Meridie, derivation of; M. Warren, **17** 32.
Noun, the collective, Vergil's views of; W. B. Carr, **8** 24.
Pronunciation of; J. B. Feuling, **1** A 11; S. S. Haldeman, **1** A 11; C. A.

Digitized by Google

LATIN (continued).
Bristed, **1** A 12; A. N. Arnold, **1** A 12; report of committee on, **1** A 21; F. Stengel, **4** 19; M. Fisher, **12** 21.
of Latin, as presented in several recent (1874) Grammars; S. S. Haldeman, IV 44 (**4** 20).
certain differences among the ancient Romans in the pronunciation of their language; T. Peck, **7** 26.
statistics as to the pronunciation of Latin in American colleges and universities; W. G. Richardson, **6** 11.
testimony of the *Talmud* respecting *c* and *s*; J. S. Blackwell, **12** 5.
Quantity, notes on; T. Peck, XIII 50 (**13** 28).
Rime in Latin and Greek poetry; J. B. Feuling, **8** 9.
Sangallensis codex 912, M. Warren, XV 124 (**15** 19); Hebrew words in, C. Adler, **17** 4.
Sequence of tenses; W. G. Hale, **17** 28.
Subjunctive in principal clauses, development of; A. Harkness, X 76 (**10** 13).
Syntax (Latin) in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, influence of; W. B. Owen, XIII 59 (**13** 29).
Tenses: on the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb, A. Harkness, V 14 (**5** 22), VI 5 (**6** 10); sequence of, W. G. Hale, **17** 28.
Text-book, an old; T. W. Higginson, **2** 19.
Vulgate, characteristics of its Latinity; C. Short, **5** 13.
Literature:
Caesar's Gallic Wars, the tradition of, from Cicero to Orosius, E. G. Sihler, XVIII 19 (**18** 6); the proper names in the first sentence of the *Commentaries*, C. M. O'Keefe, **6** 13.
Cicero: *Ad familiares*, account of a new MS., R. F. Leighton, **10** 12;
De legibus III 3, 6–5, 12, W. A. Merrill, **19** 8;
De legibus, peculiarities of diction and syntax in, W. A. Merrill, **18** 31;
tradition of Caesar's Gallic Wars in Cicero, E. G. Sihler, XVIII 19 (**18** 6);
a new source in Plutarch's Life of Cicero; A. Gudeman, XX 139 (**20** 36).
Comedy: the term *contamination* in reference to; F. D. Allen, **19** 25.
Glossaries, with special reference to the Codex Sangallensis 912; M. Warren, XV 124 (**15** 19).
Horace: *De Arte poetica* 175, 176; L. S. Potwin, **17** 37.
Lactantius, etymologies of; W. C. Cattell, **11** 17.
Lucretius, philosophy of; C. K. Nelson, **16** 51.
Mediæval Latin MS. fragment in library of University of South Carolina; F. P. Brewer, **5** 5.
Orosius, tradition of Caesar's Gallic Wars in; E. G. Sihler, XVIII 19 (**18** 6).
Seneca *De Beneficiis*, the sources of; H. N. Fowler, XVII 24 (**17** 9).
Text-book, an old Latin; T. W. Higginson, **2** 19.
Tacitus: authorship of the *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, T. Peck, X 105 (**10** 33);

Digitized by Google

LATIN (continued).
Two passages in the *Germania*, W. F. Allen, **4** 4.
Terence, relative value of the MSS. of; E. M. Pease, XVIII 30 (**18** 17).
Vergil and Plato, E. G. Sihler; XI 72 (**11** 33).
Ecl. IV, W. S. Scarborough; **19** 36.
fatalism, W. S. Scarborough; **16** 36.
hexameters; S. S. Haldeman; **9** 6.
view of the collective noun, W. B. Carr, **8** 24.
Vulgate, the, its history and the characteristics of its Latinity; C. Short, **5** 13.
History, Manners, Customs, etc.:
Augustus, worship of, at Alexandria; A. C. Merriam, XIV 5 (**14** 9).
Caesar: the proper names in the first sentence of the *Commentaries;* C. M. O'Keefe, **6** 13.
Caesareum and the worship of Augustus at Alexandria; A. C. Merriam, XIV 5 (**14** 9).
Crastinus episode at Palaepharsalus; B. Perrin, XV 46 (**15** 6).
Crisis at Rome, A.D. 33, the monetary; W. F. Allen, XVIII 5 (**18** 20).
Gallic Wars, Caesar's: the tradition of, from Cicero to Orosius; E. G. Sihler, XVIII 19 (**18** 6).
Lex Curiata de imperio; W. F. Allen, XIX 5 (**19** 31).
Mons Graupius, the battle of; W. F. Allen, XI 83 (**11** 26).
Munda, situation of; W. I. Knapp, **17** 37.
Roman constitution, changes proposed in Cicero's Legg. III 3, 6–5, 12; W. A. Merrill, **19** 8.
Roman elements in English law; H. L. Baker, **20** 22.
Saltus Teutoburgiensis; W. F. Allen, **19** 35.
Schoolmasters, wages of, in ancient Rome; R. F. Leighton, **13** 50.
Vestal fire, method of lighting; M. H. Morgan, **19** 22.
PHILOLOGY, history, principles and methods.
American School of Classical Studies at Athens (P. A.); W. W. Goodwin, **16** 11.
Ancient and modern languages, order of precedence in study of; G. F. Comfort, **2** 9.
Bury's, Richard de, *Philobiblon;* A. F. West, **20** 17.
Classical study, desirableness of thorough, to the attainment of the ends of the higher education; B. W. Dwight, **1** A 17.
Comparative grammar in college; F. A. March, **4** 18.
Comparative philology, some exaggerations in; C. A. Bristed, **3** 22.
Doctor of philosophy, degree of; **13** 6.
Embryological method in the study of language; G. W. Samson, **1** B 19.
English, study of, see under English.
Epistulae obscurorum virorum; M. H. Stratton, **20** 34.
Etymology, ideological, as a distinct method in philology; S. P. Andrews, **10** 4.
Grammatical terms according to the teachings of comparative philology, a concise system of; A. Douai, **4** 11.

Digitized by Google

PHILOLOGY (continued).

Historical method and purpose in philology (P. A.); M. L. D'Ooge, **15** 11.

Instruction in classical language, the best method; A. Harkness, **1** A 14; H. M. Colton, **1** A 15.

Instruction in language, post-graduate; G. F. Comfort, **1** A 24.

Leyden, University of (P. A.); F. D. Allen, **13** 18.

Linguistic studies, the true foundation for a course of; E. H. Magill, **1** A 15.

Modern and ancient languages, order of precedence in study of; G. F. Comfort, **2** 9.

Modern languages, the true position of, in our college curriculum; A. H. Mixer, **1** A 23.

Philobiblon, Richard de Bury's; A. F. West, **20** 17.

Philologian, special province of the American (P. A.); B. L. Gildersleeve, **9** 21.

Philological accuracy, its relation to scientific nomenclature; D. S. Martin, **7** 32.

Philological studies during the century, the progress and results of (P. A.); A. Harkness, **7** 11.

Philological study in America, history and progress of (P. A.); T. D. Seymour, **20** 10.

Philology, study of (P. A.); W. D. Whitney, **1** B 4.

Planudes, Maximus, life and works; A. Gudeman, **20** 6.

Reuchlin and the *Epistulae obscurorum virorum*; M. H. Stratton, **20** 34.

Ritschl, Friedr., personal reminiscences of; B. L. Gildersleeve, **8** 14.

Sight-reading with volunteer classes; A. C. Merriam, **11** 30.

Textual criticism, conservatism in (P. A.); M. W. Humphreys, **14** 7.

PHONETIC CHANGE. } See LANGUAGE, SCIENCE OF.
PHONETIC LAW. }

PHONETICS. See also under LANGUAGE, SCIENCE OF.

Alphabet, see English (*Language*).

Articulation; W. D. Whitney, **12** 21; S. Porter, **16** 45.

Bell's *Visible Speech*; S. Porter, **16** 45.

Bell's vowel-scheme; S. Porter, **12** 18.

Consonants and vowels, their relation; W. D. Whitney, **5** 26.

Consonant notation; F. A. March, **17** 30.

Consonant, sonant fricative; S. Porter, **15** 40.

Phonetic reform, see *Spelling* under English.

Phonetics, relation of, to philology; J. E. Munson, **1** A 22.

Phonetic science, contributions of the phonograph to; W. C. Sawyer, **9** 11.

Sibilant, the palatal, notation of, in English; J. C. Wightman, **7** 29.

Speech, music in; M. L. Rouse, **18** 34.

Surd and sonant: relation of; W. D. Whitney, VIII 41 (**8** 8), **13** 12; F. A. March, **13** 33; S. R. Porter, **14** 14.

Vowels and consonants, their relation; W. D. Whitney, **5** 26.

Digitized by Google

PHONETICS (continued).
Vowel articulations, position of the larynx in; S. Porter, **16** 45.
Vowel definition; F. A. March, **17** 30.
Vowel-scheme of Melville Bell; S. Porter, **12** 18.
Vowel-utterance, observations on; A. Schnyder, **15** 38.
SANSKRIT.
Accent, nature and designation of Sanskrit accent; W. D. Whitney, I 20 (**1** B 8).
A-kāra, quality of; E. W. Hopkins, **20** 40.
Aorist (*siṣ* and *sa*); W. D. Whitney, **16** 37.
Çaraṇá, *çárman*, *çárīra*, and other derivatives; C. R. Lanman, **15** 7.
Conditional sentences: some forms of, in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit; J. B. Greenough, II 159 (**2** 28).
Kaṭha Upanishad, a translation of; W. D. Whitney, **17** 11.
Rāmāyaṇa, comparison of the three recensions; S. B. Platner, **16** 47.
Roots of the Sanskrit language; W. D. Whitney, XVI 5 (**16** 27).
Verb, system of the Sanskrit; W. D. Whitney, **7** 6.
SEMITIC LANGUAGES (for divisions see ARABIC, etc.).
Greek philosophy, notes on the tradition of the Oriental descent of; E. G. Sihler, **11** 5.
Home of the primitive Semitic race; C. H. Toy, XII 26 (**12** 6).
Pronouns, Semitic personal; C. H. Toy, **13** 10.
Semitic and Indo-European relationship, the question of; W. D. Whitney, **7** 26.
Semitic languages in the Encyclopædia Britannica; C. Adler, **18** 14.
Semitic languages, study of (P. A.); C. H. Toy, **11** 10.
Shemitic or Semitic? J. S. Blackwell, **12** 27.
Stems, Shemitic derived; C. H. Toy, **10** 22.
Verb, modal development of the Semitic verb; C. H. Toy, X 5 (**10** 27).
SIAMESE.
A Siamese MS.; C. H. Brigham, **5** 28.
SLAVONIC.
Orpheus: an ancient Bulgarian poem concerning; C. F. Morse, **2** 27.
SPANISH.
Historical development of the Spanish language; F. Stengel, **3** 8.
SYRIAC.
Syriac legends; I. H. Hall, **20** 29.
Syrian scribes, the legacy of (P. A.); I. H. Hall, **19** 9.
TIBETO-BURMAN.
Tibeto-Burman group of languages; J. Avery, **16** 17.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

1888.

VOLUME XIX.

Published by the Association.

BOSTON:
PRESS OF J. S. CUSHING & CO.
1889.

Digitized by Google

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1888–1889.

PRESIDENT.

THOMAS D. SEYMOUR.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

CHARLES R. LANMAN. BERNADOTTE PERRIN.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.

JOHN H. WRIGHT.

TREASURER.

JOHN H. WRIGHT.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Officers above named, and —

MARTIN L. D'OOGE. FRANCIS A. MARCH.
BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE. JULIUS SACHS.
WILLIAM D. WHITNEY.

1889–1890.

PRESIDENT.

CHARLES R. LANMAN.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

JULIUS SACHS. JOHN H. WRIGHT.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

TREASURER.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Officers above named, and —

MARTIN L. D'OOGE. FRANCIS A. MARCH.
BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE. BERNADOTTE PERRIN.
WILLIAM D. WHITNEY.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

406
A512
American philological association
Transactions.
105981 19-20 1888-89

NAME	DATE	NAME	DATE
Morton	3-10-37		

105981

Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 007 253 771

S NOT CIRCULATE

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google